DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 106 419 UD 015 155

AUTHOR	David, Kenneth; King, William
TITLE	Review and Analysis of Problems of Recent Immigrants in Hawaii.
INSTITUTION	Honolulu City and County Office of Human Resources, Hawaii.
PUB DATE	15 Feb 74
NOTE	85p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$4.43 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Acculturation; Culture Conflict; Demography; *Educational Problems; Employment Problems; Federal Legislation; *Filipino Americans; Health Needs; Housing Needs; *Immigrants; Language Handicaps; *Migrant Problems; Social Problems
IDENTIFIERS	*Hawaii

ABSTRACT

This paper reviews the problems that recent immigrants to Hawaii encounter. Available data about recent immigrants are quite limited in scope because the information (a) fails to focus specifically on recent immigrants; (b) fails to include appropriate samples, and (c) contains many methodological biases. Since the passage of the present Immigration Act in 1965, the number of immigrants to Hawaii has increased to 6,055 in 1971 with Filipinos accounting for 61.2 percent of the 1971 total. The problem areas of recent immigrants that are discussed in the paper consist of education and language, employment, housing, health, and intercultural problems. The major findings for each of the problem areas follow: (1) many Samoan immigrants have less than a high school education; (2) for Filipino immigrants, there is a problem of under-employment for professionals and perhaps a problem associated with a change of occupation for many others; (3) residency and U.S. citizenship requirements have severely limited employment opportunities; (4) housing is the problem most frequently mentioned to be an immediate concern by Filipino and Samoan immigrants; (5) recent immigrants from the Philippines account for a disproportionately high number of newly reported cases of active tuberculosis; and, (6) various intercultural problems are encountered. (Author/JM)

ED106419

FRANK F. FASI
MAYOR

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

February 15, 1974

MESSAGE

The problems of immigrants have long been of concern to the City and County of Honolulu and to the State of Hawaii. Consequently, this study, Review and Analysis of Problems of Recent Immigrants in Hawaii, was undertaken to determine the extent and frequency of problems of recent immigrants to our State and to assist citizen groups in planning for the integration of Hawaii's immigrant population into our local society. Authors of the study were Dr. Kenneth David and Mr. William King, assisted by other staff members of the Office of Human Resources.

The study was originally published in August 1972. The widespread demand for it has resulted in this second printing. It is my hope that it will continue to prove as useful to persons and groups working for social equity elsewhere in the world as it has to us in Honolulu.

FRANK F. FASI, Mayor
City and County of Honolulu

UD 015155

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY i

INTRODUCTION 1

Statement of the Purpose 1

Availability of Data on Recent Immigrants 1

Background and Legal Procedures 3

Hawaii Immigration Patterns 4

PROBLEMS OF IMMIGRANTS 10

Educational and Language Problems 10

Employment Problems 18

Housing Problems 37

Health Problems 45

Intercultural Problems 49

IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH 55

REFERENCES 57

APPENDIX 62

Background of U.S. Immigration Legislation 63

The Immigration Process 68

The Naturalization Process 74

SUMMARY

The purpose of this paper is to review and clarify the problems that recent immigrants to Hawaii encounter. Available data about recent immigrants are quite limited in scope because the information (a) fails to focus specifically on recent immigrants, (b) fails to include representative samples of either the total immigrant population or immigrant subgroups, and (c) contains many methodological biases.

Since the passage of the present Immigration Act in 1965, the number of immigrants to Hawaii has increased from 1,721 in 1965 to 6,055 in 1971, with Filipinos accounting for 61.2% of the 1971 total. For 1971, Hawaii received more immigrants proportionate to its population (7.9 per 1,000) than any of the other States. Samoan immigrants from American Samoa are not included in the preceding figures because they are classified as American nationals.

The problem areas of recent immigrants that are discussed in the paper consist of educational and language, employment, housing, health, and intercultural problems. The major findings for each of the problem areas follow:

a. Many Samoan immigrants have less than a high school education, which tends to limit their employment opportunities. Difficulty with the English language appears to be a problem for many recent immigrant groups, e.g., Filipinos, Koreans, Japanese, Chinese, and Samoans.

b. For Filipino immigrants, there is a problem of underemployment for professionals and perhaps a problem associated with a change of occupation for many others (e.g., farmers and fishermen being employed in the service occupations). For Samoan immigrants, a major problem seems to be one of unemployment.

c. Residency and United States citizenship requirements have severely limited the employment opportunities for immigrants; however, recent legal decisions indicate that these requirements will eventually be eliminated.

d. Housing is the problem most frequently mentioned to be an immediate concern by Filipino and Samoan immigrants, with severely overcrowded conditions being the primary undesirable factor.

e. Recent immigrants from the Philippines account for a disproportionately high number of newly reported cases of active tuberculosis. Samoan and Filipino immigrants account for most of the recent cases of leprosy, e.g., 15 of the 16 cases for 1970.

f. Various intercultural problems are encountered by recent immigrants, such as difficulties in adapting the extended family system of Samoans to the nuclear family system of Hawaii.

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Purpose

The present study was undertaken to determine the extent of problems of recent immigrants to Hawaii. Within the bounds of this paper, a recent immigrant is defined as a person who has moved to the United States since 1965 and who has established his domicile in Hawaii. This definition of an immigrant is similar to that of an "immigrant alien" as defined by the immigration law (Hoff, 1970). The year 1965 is a logically convenient date to separate recent immigrants from longer-term immigrants. Not only is 1965 the midpoint for the 1960-70 decade, but the new immigration act (P.L. 89-236, 79 Stat. 911) was enacted on October 3, 1965 (although the act was not fully put into effect until 1968).

Samoans who have migrated to Hawaii from American Samoa are classified as United States nationals under the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952; however, from a social-cultural perspective they may be viewed as immigrants. That is, many American Samoans have become permanent residents of Hawaii and many of the problems that they have encountered in Hawaii are probably similar to the problems of immigrants throughout the world. Consequently, Samoans who have migrated to Hawaii since 1965, whether from Western Samoa or American Samoa, will be considered as immigrants within the context of this paper. On the other hand, we are not including as immigrants such persons as migrants from the mainland or short-term sojourners (non-immigrant aliens) from other countries such as tourists, foreign students, visiting professors, or businessmen.

Availability of Data on Recent Immigrants

There is relatively little information that has a direct bearing on the problem of recent immigrants to Hawaii. In attempting to glean valid information from the existing data, numerous difficulties have been encountered. More precisely, the present sources of data are of quite limited value because they (a) fail to focus specifically on recent immigrants, (b) fail to include representative samples of either the total immigrant population or immigrant subgroups, and (c) contain many methodological biases. Further discussion of the limitations on the available data about recent immigrants follows:

A. Sources that fail to focus on recent immigrants.

1. Studies of ethnic differences. Numerous investigations of different ethnic groups in Hawaii have been conducted, but usually there is no way of accurately determining how the information is related to recent immigrants. For example, studies of the Filipino community in Hawaii usually fail to provide information about recent Filipino immigrants, and it would seem unwise to assume that the problems of the Filipino community are the same as those of recent Filipino immigrants.

2. Census data on non-United States citizens (aliens). This information usually fails to focus on recent immigrants, for example, the long-

term immigrant who has not become a citizen may be included with recent immigrants. Also, the non-United States citizen category does not distinguish between various classes of non-citizens, e.g., American Samoans (United States nationals) and aliens may not be differentiated.

3. Studies of non-immigrant aliens. Information about non-immigrant aliens, such as foreign students, makes it quite hazardous to generalize to the immigrant population. It is quite obvious that a foreign student population would most likely differ significantly from the immigrant population.

B. Studies that fail to have representative immigration samples.

Most of these studies of recent immigrants deal with either Filipinos or Samoans, which would lead to difficulty if one were to generalize to the total immigrant population, e.g., Chinese, Japanese, Korean, and Micronesian immigrants are rarely included in the sampled groups although they are immigrating to Hawaii. Although studies of Filipino and Samoan immigrants may be valid when limiting the interpretation to Samoans and Filipinos, most of the studies have serious sampling biases. Moreover, it is questionable as to how adequately most of the samples represent any subgroup of immigrants; thus, what constitutes the problems of various recent immigrant groups remains essentially a matter of conjecture. Aside from Filipinos and Samoans, there is almost no information about the difficulties of other immigrant groups--even studies of a biased nature are quite scarce.

C. Methodological biases.

1. Questionnaire data. Much of the available information was derived from the self-reports of immigrants, either by means of an interview or responding to a written questionnaire. The biases commonly found in self-reports have become well-known, and when considering the cross-cultural factors that may invalidate a study of immigrants one should be especially cautious in interpreting such data. Several of the biases that were likely to have influenced the studies of immigrants would be (a) language difficulties in interpretation, (b) cultural difficulties in interpretation, e.g., what does it mean to a Filipino immigrant when he is asked if he has a social problem?, (c) socially desirable answers, e.g., a tendency for persons from Asian cultures to give "polite" answers is a common source of misinterpretation, (d) deliberate faking, e.g., at times it may be in an immigrant's best interest to give a false answer, especially when one considers that deportation is always possible. Some of the difficulties that an interviewer may encounter were aptly expressed in Yost's (1965, p. 60) study of Samoans of the Nanakuli-Makaha area:

> It should be made clear from the start that the writer has reservations about the reliability of some of the data on the educational achievements of the adult members of the households. In some cases persons could not recall the number of

years they had attended school because "that was a long time ago." In other cases one spouse was completely uninformed about the other spouse's education. When it was impossible or impractical to obtain the information from an adult himself, the researcher could only place the case in the "unknown" category. Furthermore, at times the interviewer received conflicting reports and at other times doubted that she and the respondent were counting years and grades in the same way.

2. Anecdotal data. Many immigrant problems seem to have been labeled such by relying on various unverified sources. In some instances the statement of a single immigrant is used to establish an immigrant "problem," and in other instances the source may be the opinions of various task forces, ethnic groups, government officials, and newspaper reporters. Although these sources may provide useful working hypotheses, they would not be adequate sources for the formation of definitive statements about immigrants and their problems.

Background and Legal Procedures

The United States Constitution authorized Congress to regulate immigration and extends the protection of the Bill of Rights and the 14th Amendment to citizens and resident aliens alike. The issuance of visas is regulated by the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs of the Department of State, whereas the admission of aliens at the port of entry is controlled by the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the Department of Justice.

Early immigration legislation was mainly aimed at the exclusion of "undesirables," but after 1921 immigration was based on national quotas derived from the number of foreign-born residents in the United States at a particular time. The present Immigration Act (Public Law 89-236, 79 Stat. 911), passed in 1965, amended 1952 legislation. The Act, which abolished the "national origins quota system" and other forms of discrimination, is aimed at reuniting families and bringing in skilled workers. When fully implemented in 1968, annually it allocated 120,000 visas for persons from Western Hemisphere countries (i.e., North and South America) and 170,000 visas for those from all other countries, except for "immediate relatives" and certain other classes of "special immigrants."

For each of the countries not in the Western Hemisphere, the number of visas issued annually may not exceed 20,000. For the area outside of the Western Hemisphere, a seven-tiered preference system reserves 125,800 visas in preference categories 1, 2, 4, and 5 for (a) sons and daughters of both immigrants and United States citizens, (b) spouses of immigrants, and (c) brothers and sisters of United States citizens. The 3rd preference allocates 17,000 visas to professionals and others of exceptional ability, the 6th preference allocates 17,000 visas for workers in occupations in which United States labor is in short supply, and the 7th preference allocates 10,200 visas to refugees. Applicants are first considered according to preference, and then within each preference category according to the date of application.

An immigrant is usually required to have a valid passport and visa. He secures the visa by appearing before a consular officer and filing an application, together with a $5.00 fee, photographs, and certain supporting documents. Fingerprints are taken and a medical examination is required. If the applicant is without sufficient funds or an assured job, affidavits from United States residents may be required, guaranteeing that the applicant will not become a public charge. Persons coming from Western Hemisphere countries (except for immediate relatives), professionals and other workers coming within the 3rd and 6th preferences, and all non-preference immigrants must also present certification from the Secretary of Labor showing that their employment will not adversely affect domestic wages and working conditions. If all the requirements are met and the application is approved, the applicant pays a fee of $20.00 and receives an "Immigrant Visa and Alien Registration Form," which together with the original application form and supporting documents constitutes his visa.

After a period of residence in the United States, which usually varies from three (in the case of spouses of United States citizens) to five years, the immigrant is eligible to file an application for naturalization with the Immigration and Naturalization Service if he is at least 18 years of age. After submitting an application to file a petition for naturalization, he is notified to appear before a naturalization examiner with at least two witnesses. At such time the immigrant is given an oral test to determine both his English proficiency and his knowledge of United States history and government. The immigrant is also expected to be "loyal to the United States" and to be of "good moral character." If all the requirements are met, after a waiting period of at least 30 days, the candidate is notified to appear before the naturalization court. Upon the recommendation of the examiner, a judge administers the oath of allegiance and confers citizenship upon the applicant.

Hawaii Immigration Patterns

An analysis of data from the fourth count of the 1970 census for Hawaii shows the year of immigration for the foreign-born population of Oahu (see Table 1). The values for Table 1, which are estimates based on 5% of the total Hawaii sample, show that approximately 38% of the foreign-born population arrived from 1960-70, 21% from 1945-59, 14% from 1925-44, and 21% before 1925. If we consider "recent immigrants" to refer to those who arrived in Hawaii since 1965, it is apparent that the majority of the foreign-born population consists of long-term immigrants.

The ethnic background of all permanent resident aliens residing in Hawaii for 19[illegible] is shown in Table 2. Table 2 shows that Filipinos (53.7%) and Japanese (25.7%) compose the largest proportion of permanent resident aliens in Hawaii. However, one should keep in mind that naturalized citizens and American Samoans are not aliens; consequently, they are not included in the table.

A view of recent immigration trends in Hawaii can be seen in Table 3. The number of immigrants to Hawaii from 1962-65 appears to have been relatively stable, with an apparent increase occurring between 1965 (1,721 immigrants) and 1966 (3,070 immigrants). There was a gradual increase in number of immi-

grants from 1965 to 1971, except for the year 1970 (for which there is some question about the accuracy of the figure of 9,013). In all likelihood the increase beginning in 1965 can be attributed to the 1965 change in the immigration law.

TABLE 1

YEAR OF IMMIGRATION FOR THE FOREIGN-BORN POPULATION OF OAHU

Year	Number	Percent
1960-70	21,974	38.2
1945-59	12,098	21.0
1925-44	7,881	13.7
Before 1925	12,022	20.9
Not Reported	3,511	6.1
TOTAL	57,486	99.9*

Source: Walker, W. "Foreign-born population of Oahu," from the 1970 United States census, 4th count, based on 5% sample. Unpublished printout, Office of Social Resources, City & County of Honolulu, 1972.

*The total for the Percent column is the sum of the percentages. Slight deviations from a total 100% occur when the percentages to be summed are rounded off.

TABLE 2

PERMANENT RESIDENT ALIENS REPORTING ADDRESSES IN HAWAII FOR 1971

Nationality	Number	Percent
Philippines	27,215	53.7
Japan	13,020	25.7
China & Taiwan	1,933	3.7
United Kingdom	1,499	3.0
Canada	1,429	2.8
Others	5,606	11.1
TOTAL	50,702	100.1

Source: Derived from data in the "Annual Report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service" for 1971. U.S. Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1972, p. 95.

TABLE 3

IMMIGRANTS INTENDING TO BECOME PERMANENT RESIDENTS OF HAWAII, 1962-71

Year	Number for Hawaii	Number for all States
1962	2,048	283,763
1963	1,767	306,260
1964	1,623	292,248
1965	1,721	296,697
1966	3,070	323,040
1967	3,825	361,972
1968	4,693	454,448
1969	5,199	358,579
1970	9,013*	373,336
1971	6,055	370,478
1962-71 (TOTAL)	39,014	3,420,811

Source: Derived from data in "Annual Report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service" for 1971. U.S. Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1972, p. 46.

*This figure appears to be unusually high and may be incorrect.

The ethnic background of immigrants to Hawaii for 1971 is shown in Table 4. It is obvious that the predominant immigrant group is from the Philippines (61.2%), with considerably smaller percentages for Korea (9.4%), Japan (6.8%), China and Taiwan (4.5%), Canada (1.3%), and others (16.9%).

TABLE 4

IMMIGRANTS REPORTING HAWAII AS PLACE OF INTENDED PERMANENT RESIDENCE, 1971

Country of Origin	Number	Percent
Philippines	3,704	61.2
Korea	568	9.4
Japan	409	6.8
China & Taiwan	271	4.5
Canada	81	1.3
Others	1,022	16.9
TOTAL	6,055	100.1

Source: Based upon data in "Hawaii's In-migrants, 1971." Statistical Report 89, Department of Planning and Economic Development, 1972, p. 15.

The frequency with which immigrants chose Hawaii in 1971, as opposed to the other States, can be seen in Table 5. The States are ranked on the basis of the number of immigrants for 1971. Hawaii ranked 12th with 6,055 admitted immigrants, although Hawaii ranked 40th for total population (769,000 residents). The righthand column in Table 5 shows that proportionate to its total population, Hawaii has more immigrants arriving (7.9 immigrants per 1,000 population) than the 11 top-ranked States. Although not shown in Table 5, proportionate to its total population, Hawaii had, in fact, more immigrants arriving than any of the other 49 States. In view of the disproportionate influx of immigrants to Hawaii, we might suspect that problems related to immigration would be greater in Hawaii than in most of the other States.

TABLE 5

IMMIGRANTS ADMITTED BY STATE OF INTENDED PERMANENT RESIDENCE

JULY 1, 1970 - JUNE 30, 1971

State	Population				No. Per 1,000
	Immigrants		State Residents		
	Number	Rank	Number	Rank	
New York	92,478	1	18,237,000	2	5.1
California	69,825	2	19,953,000	1	3.5
New Jersey	23,593	3	7,168,000	8	3.3
Illinois	23,253	4	11,114,000	5	2.1
Texas	20,210	5	11,197,000	4	1.8
Florida	17,438	6	6,789,000	9	2.6
Massachusetts	15,760	7	5,689,000	10	2.8
Pennsylvania	10,132	8	11,794,000	3	.9
Michigan	9,274	9	8,875,000	7	1.0
Ohio	8,377	10	10,652,000	6	.8
Connecticut	8,032	11	3,032,000	24	2.6
Hawaii	6,055	12	769,000	40	7.9
.	.	.	.	.	.
.	.	.	.	.	.
.	.	.	.	.	.
Wyoming	153	50	332,000	49	.5

Sources: Data in the "State Residents" column are derived from the American Almanac: The U.S. Book of Facts, Statistics and Information for 1972. New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1972, p. 12.

Data in the "Immigrants" column are derived from the "Annual Report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service" for 1971. U.S. Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1972, p. 46.

An historical review of immigration to Hawaii and the United States from Asia follows:

1850-1860 First large-scale oriental immigration: large numbers of Chinese laborers were recruited to work in frontier development on the mainland. Chinese contract workers for Hawaii sugar plantations began arriving in 1852. By 1886, there were 20,000 Chinese in Hawaii, one-fourth of whom were plantation workers (Kung, 1962). But increasing apprehension over loss of control over labor and an oversupply of Chinese workers led to an interest in recruiting plantation workers of other nationalities for Hawaii (Lind, 1967).

1878 Between 1878 and 1887, approximately 17,500 Portugese plantation workers were recruited for Hawaii. Compared to the Chinese, a larger proportion of the Portuguese were women and more of the Portugese planned to stay permanently in Hawaii. Thus, by 1910, the Portuguese outnumbered the Chinese (Lind, 1967).

1882 Resentment, concentrated in the Western states, of Chinese competition for jobs and their different cultural ways led to passage of the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 which slowed down immigration to the mainland by blocking the entrance of unskilled workers (Boyd, 1971).

1886 Following an agreement between Japan and Hawaii (1886), large numbers of Japanese contract laborers were recruited for Hawaii. By 1899, a total of almost 83,000 Japanese had arrived in Hawaii (Strong, 1934).

1898 With annexation, Hawaii came under the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, but large numbers of Asians continued to come to the Islands. Thus, by 1908, an additional 110,000 Japanese workers had arrived in Hawaii (Lind, 1967).

1901 Almost 6,000 Puerto Rican workers were recruited for Hawaii. Despite their initial small numbers, by the 1960's they appeared to be more numerous than either the Koreans or the Spaniards (Lind, 1967).

1904-1905 About 8,000 Koreans immigrated to Hawaii (Lind, 1967).

1907-1913 Approximately 8,000 Spaniards were recruited for work in Hawaii, but many of them later went on to California, leaving only about 2,430 Spaniards here by the time of the 1920 Census (Lind, 1967).

1908 Competition for jobs by increasing numbers of Japanese immigrants on the mainland resulted in agitation in the Western states for restrictions on the admission of Japanese. This led to the signing of a "Gentlemen's Agreement" in 1908 by Japan and the United States, whereby Japan consented to issue passports to those bound for the United States only if they were non-laborers. The Agreement resulted in a selective change in the characteristics of the more recent Japanese immigrants (Boyd, 1971).

1907-1931 Almost 120,000 Filipinos, the last of the major ethnic groups to come to Hawaii, were recruited to work on the plantations by planters who were eager to break the control of plantation labor held by the Japanese (Lind, 1967). Many of these Filipinos, who as American nationals prior to 1935 were not subject to immigration quotas, went on to California or returned to the Philippines (Boyd, 1971).

1924 As a result of decades of agitation against increasing oriental immigration, an Immigration Act was passed which effectively ended larger-scale Asian immigration (Boyd, 1971).

1943 The Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882 was repealed in response to Chinese participation in World War II and replaced with an annual quota of 105 persons from China (Boyd, 1971).

1945-1946 Further legislation facilitated the entry to the United States of oriental spouses, fiancees, and children by waiving certain immigration requirements, such as quota limitations (Boyd, 1971).

1952 The McCarran-Walter Act made all races eligible for immigration, but it only allocated annual quotas of 100 persons for the Philippines, China, and Japan, respectively. Half of each quota was reserved for aliens with skills critically needed in the United States (Boyd, 1971).

1953 The Refugee Relief Act of 1953 authorized the admission of 2,000 Chinese refugees (Boyd, 1971).

1965 The Immigration Act of 1965 abolished the discrimination of immigrants because of their race or nationality. It established an annual ceiling of 170,000 visas for persons from non-Western Hemisphere countries, with a limit of 20,000 visas for each country and a seven-tiered preference system aimed at reuniting families and bringing in skilled immigrants.

PROBLEMS OF IMMIGRANTS

Educational and Language Problems

There are no available statistics which would present a comprehensive view of the educational level of recent immigrants. However, several surveys have provided some partial information about certain groups within the immigrant population. For example, Agmata (1970) reported the results from a health education survey of 228 Filipino immigrants (see Table 6).

TABLE 6

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF 228 FILIPINO IMMIGRANTS

Years Completed	Number	Percent
0-8	96	42.1
9-12	50	21.9
12-Over	53	23.2
No Response	10	4.4
Unknown	19	8.3
TOTAL	228	99.9

Source: Based upon data in Agmata, H. Y. "Final Report on the Program of Health Education of Immigrants." Unpublished report to the Chamber of Commerce of Hawaii, Department of Health, 1970, p. 16.

In another study of Filipino immigrants (Lasman et al., 1971), the responses for the item "What was your highest level of education completed in the Philippines?" are shown in Table 7.

The Agmata study (Table 6) shows that approximately 23% of the sample reported at least a high school education, whereas the Lasman et al. study (Table 7) shows 53% reporting at least a high school education. One factor accounting for the lower percentage (23%) of the Agmata study is that the sample probably included some long-term immigrants who tend to have fewer years of education. In any case, the results suggest that a considerable number (probably more than 25%) of recent Filipino immigrants have at least a high school education, with a substantial number having a college degree. On the other hand, many Filipino immigrants also have less than an eighth grade education (Tables 6 & 7 show 42% and 46%, respectively).

The educational level of 6,544 Samoans is shown in Table 8.

TABLE 7

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF 503 FILIPINO IMMIGRANTS

Grades Completed	Number	Percent
0-8	233	46.3
High School & Technical School	148	29.4
University or College	116	23.1
No Response	6	1.2
TOTAL	503	100.0

Source: Data are derived from Lasman, L., Buluran, O. J., Nolan, J. and O'Neil, L. "A Study of Attitudes of Filipino Immigrants About Hawaii." Unpublished master's thesis, University of Hawaii, 1971, p. 43.

TABLE 8

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF 6,544 SAMOANS

Grades Completed	Number	Percent
0-8	3,050	46.6
High School	593	9.1
Some College	363	5.5
Unknown	2,537	38.8
TOTAL	6,544	100.0

Source: Data are derived from "Report of the State Immigration Service Center." Commission on Manpower and Full Employment, State of Hawaii, 1972, p. 42.

The data from Table 8 suggest that the educational level of the Samoan population in Hawaii is somewhat low, with very few college graduates and perhaps considerably less than 50% high school graduates. The lack of a high school education would be extremely likely in view of the fact that the first public high school of American Samoa opened in 1946 (see Yost, 1965, pp. 61-65, for a brief historical description of education in American Samoa).

Unfortunately, the survey had several shortcomings which prevent making conclusive statements about recent Samoan immigrants. For example, difficulties in interpretation occur when we consider such problems as (a) 39% "Unknown" responses, (b) lack of information about recent immigrants vs. long-term immigrants, and (c) possible inaccuracy of the reported data.

In spite of the possible biasing influences on the educational data of recent immigrants, the available evidence suggests that among recently arrived immigrants the Samoans average fewer years of formal education than Filipinos. It is reasonable to expect other immigrant groups to show average differences in educational level, for example, Japanese, Chinese, and Korean immigrants may significantly differ from Samoans and Filipinos.

Many immigrants appear to place a high value on education. For example, in the Lasman et al. (1971) study, 418 (83%) of the Filipino immigrants reported that they felt they needed more education in order to earn a living equivalent to what they did in the Philippines, whereas 63 (13%) felt that they needed about the same education and 20 (4%) felt they needed less education.

Also, a survey of 43 Samoan families living in the Kalihi Valley Housing Project found that 28 of the families reported that the education of their children was their reason for immigrating to Hawaii (Ala'ilima, 1966). Ala'ilima also noted that the parents had high ambitions for their children, although they had done relatively little concrete planning to ensure that the ambitions were implemented. The major parental complaint, according to the author, was a lack of supervision in and around the schools. Other problems mentioned were that the children lacked a quiet place to study and that the parents were limited in the degree of academic assistance that they could provide to their children.

Agmata's (1970) field survey suggests that many Filipino immigrants are quite limited in English proficiency, based on her statement that communication was a serious problem for the immigrants (especially children) and that they usually requested her to speak in the Ilocano language.

In the study by Yost (1965), she reported that many Samoans desired to have their children educated in Hawaii so that the children would learn to speak English fluently. Yost concluded that her results suggest that Samoan parents believe that economic and social advancement, in both Samoa and Hawaii, results from being proficient in English.

Filipino immigrants with more education are more likely to report that employment is their primary problem than immigrants with less education (see Lasman et al., 1971). Lim (1971) also reported in a survey of 100 recent Filipino immigrant families that those immigrants with an education lower than high school tended to be satisfied with their living conditions, whereas those with a college education (21% of the sample) tended to be dissatisfied. Many of the college graduates stated that they were unable to find work in their professional fields and that it was very difficult to adjust to manual labor and the "pressure of work."

The relationship between education and employment problems can most likely be accounted for by the difficulty that Filipinos with a professional background have in practicing their profession in Hawaii. Consequently, when comparing educational level with type of employment, Filipino immigrants tend to be underemployed, that is, their employment level tends to be somewhat lower than what one would normally predict from knowing one's educational level (see the section on Employment Problems for further discussion).

Most of the Filipino immigrants in the Lasman et al. (1971) sample reported that they speak both Ilocano and English (see Table 9. Item question: What languages do you speak?).

TABLE 9

LANGUAGES SPOKEN BY FILIPINO IMMIGRANTS

Language	Number	Percent
Ilocano	483	96.0
English	396	78.7
Tagalog	339	67.4
Spanish	43	8.5
Visayan	35	7.0
Other	23	4.6

Source: Data are shown in Lasman, L., Buluran, O. J., Nolan, J. and O'Neil, L. "A Study of Attitudes of Filipino Immigrants about Hawaii." Unpublished master's thesis, University of Hawaii, 1971, p. 34.
Note: Ilocano, Tagalog, and Visayan are Philippine languages.

However, it is important to note that although 79% of the sample reported that they spoke English, it is difficult to interpret this value because the accuracy of the data is unknown. Moreover, the degree of English-speaking proficiency of the immigrants is unknown, so that when an immigrant reports that he "speaks English" we do not know whether he is fairly fluent or whether he is barely able to speak a few words of English.

The results of several studies suggest that language difficulty is related to the immigrant's cultural background. For example, a survey conducted for the "1969 Governor's Conference on Immigration" found that interviewers reported the English fluency of most of the Samoans to be "easily understood," whereas a majority of the Koreans were not easily understood (see Table 10).

TABLE 10

INTERVIEWER RATINGS OF ENGLISH FLUENCY OF DIFFERENT IMMIGRANT GROUPS

Immigrant Background	Easily Understood			Total
	Yes	No	Uncertain	
Chinese	20	7	6	33
Filipino	151	57	20	228
Japanese	20	7	4	31
Korean	6	13	0	19
Samoan	47	4	2	53
Others	20	5	6	31
TOTAL	264	93	38	395

Source: Data are shown in "Proceedings of the Governor's Conference on Immigration, 1969," Vol. II.

Furthermore, the Governor's Conference survey showed that the ethnic background of the immigrants was related to how frequently they reported language to be an immediate concern (see Table 11). Table 11 shows that language was the most frequently mentioned concern for the Chinese and Japanese samples, whereas the Filipinos, Koreans, and Samoans most commonly mentioned housing as a concern. Also, an evaluation report of an acculturation project by Gilson (see Ayabe & Gilson, 1972) noted that the Koreans reported more problems on the job than Filipinos, perhaps as a result of the Koreans' greater difficulty in learning English.

Another difference in spoken English among immigrant groups according to cultural background was discussed by Hirata (1971, p. 29):

> It is observed that bilingual immigrants outnumber monolingual ones for all groups. The ratios are two to one for the Chinese and the Japanese groups and more than three to one for the Filipino group. The higher proportion of bilingual immigrants among the Filipinos can be explained by the fact that English is spoken in large Filipino metropolitan centers such as Manila, and instruction of the English language begins at the grade school level in the Philippines rather than at the high school level in Japan, Taiwan and many Chinese schools in Hong Kong. If the overall figure for bilingual immigrants seems high, it is probably due to sample bias, since we selected our respondents from petitions for citizenship and some degree of English proficiency is generally required before filing such petition.

TABLE 11

IMMEDIATE CONCERNS OF IMMIGRANTS

Concern	Ethnic Background of Immigrants							
	Chinese	Filipino	Japanese	Korean	Samoan	Other	Total	Percent
Housing	26	94	1	9	39	6	175	27.0
Language	27	61	12	5	16	6	127	19.6
Employment	19	54	3	1	21	7	105	16.2
Transportation	11	46	2	0	20	6	85	13.1
Health	12	27	1	0	12	5	57	8.8
Leisure Time	0	31	2	0	5	3	41	6.3
Social Acceptance	0	26	1	0	3	2	32	4.9
Other	0	12	0	1	7	6	26	4.0

Source: Data are derived from "Proceedings of the Governor's Conference on Immigration, 1969," Vol. II.
Note: Some respondents indicated more than one immediate concern.

In a study by the Department of Education ("Survey of Non-English Speaking Students Attending the Public Schools in Hawaii," 1968), it was reported that 1.4% (2,312 students) of the children in Hawaii schools in 1967 were Non-Native Speakers of English (NNSE). The native languages of the NNSEs are shown in Table 12.

As shown in Table 12, Philippine languages (consisting of Ilocano, Tagalog, and Visayan) are the most prevalent (36%), followed by Samoan (26%), Japanese (18%), Chinese (12%) (consisting of Cantonese and Mandarin), and Korean (2%).

Most of the NNSEs in the survey were located on Oahu (88%), with 47% of the total from the Honolulu school district (see Table 13).

An estimate of the number of school-age immigrant children was derived from available records in the following manner: In the "Governor's Conference on Immigration Proceedings," Volume II, Schmitt (1969) submitted a paper entitled "Characteristics of Immigrants Moving to Hawaii, July 1, 1968-June 30, 1969." Based on the data reported by Schmitt, 34% (1,535 persons) of all Hawaii immigrants were 0-18 years old in 1968-69. Using the value of 34% as an indicator of the proportion of 0-18 year old immigrants, the figures in Table 14 were computed from the "Annual Report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service" for 1971, p. 46, for immigrants arriving in Hawaii from 1962-1971.

The figures in Table 14 do not include Samoans from American Samoa,

TABLE 12

NATIVE LANGUAGE OF NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS OF ENGLISH IN HAWAII SCHOOLS IN 1967

Native Language	Number	Percent
Philippine (Various)	830	35.9
Samoan	611	26.4
Japanese	416	18.0
Chinese (Various)	266	11.5
Korean	40	1.7
Spanish	39	1.7
German	21	.9
South Pacific	20	.9
French	14	.6
Chamorro (Mariana Islands)	10	.4
Tongan	9	.4
Other	36	1.6
TOTAL	2,312	100.0

Source: Derived from data in "Survey of Non-English Speaking Students Attending the Public Schools in Hawaii." Research Report No. 58, Office of Research, Department of Education, State of Hawaii, 1968, p. 2.

TABLE 13

FREQUENCY OF NON-NATIVE SPEAKERS OF ENGLISH BY SCHOOL DISTRICT

District	Number	Percent
Honolulu	1,097	47.4
Central	392	16.9
Windward	302	13.1
Leeward	236	10.2
TOTAL for Oahu	2,027	87.7
Kauai	105	4.5
Maui	98	4.2
Hawaii	82	3.5
TOTAL for Neighbor Islands	285	12.3
TOTAL for State of Hawaii	2,312	100.0

Source: Derived from data in "Survey of Non-English Speaking Students Attending the Public Schools in Hawaii." Research Report No. 58, Office of Research, Department of Education, State of Hawaii, 1968, pp. 4-11.

which would undoubtedly result in substantial increases in the estimated values. The estimated values reported in the table are for the entire State of Hawaii, so that Oahu values would be approximately 78% of those figures cited, with the values of 78% being based on data from Schmitt's paper.

TABLE 14

ESTIMATED IMMIGRANTS TO HAWAII 0-18 YEARS OLD, 1962-71

Year Arrived	Number of Immigrants (0-18 Years)
1962	696
1963	601
1964	552
1965	585
1966	1,043
1967	1,300
1968	1,596
1969	1,768
1970	1,972*
1971	2,059
TOTAL	13,265

Source: See text.
*Revised value because of possible error in 1971 "Annual Report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service."

Employment Problems

Employment has been reported to be a serious problem by a substantial number of recent immigrants (see Tables 11 and 30). Because his resources are usually quite limited, the new permanent resident must quickly find a job in order to support himself or his family in Hawaii as well as relatives left behind.

A tabulation of immigrant visas issued from June 30, 1968 to July 1, 1969 to persons intending to make Hawaii their permanent home indicated that 33% (1,479 persons) of all immigrants (4,531 persons) were employed before arriving in Hawaii (see Table 15). The remaining 67% were classified as not part of the civilian labor force, i.e., those under 14 years old, students, housewives, members of the U.S. armed forces, retired persons and those without any occupation.

Table 16 indicates that many of the Filipino immigrants had shifted to jobs termed "menial tasks" (from 4.0% in the Philippines to 25.8% in Hawaii) and "hard labor" (from 2.4% to 24.9%). On the other hand, few Filipino immigrants entered the farming and fishing occupations (from 36.0% in the Philippines to 4.0% in Hawaii). The decrease in the farming and fishing occupations is to be expected, as many of the Filipino immigrants came from the rural areas of Luzon, the northernmost island in the Philippines. Many of those formerly engaged in farming and fishing apparently have been absorbed into service and unskilled labor jobs in Hawaii.

In the professional category there was a decrease from 7.2% in the Philippines to 1.4% in Hawaii (see Table 16). Apparently there has been a problem of underemployment for most Filipinos in the professions who have immigrated to Hawaii.

Immigrant professionals, in particular, are hindered in finding employment in their fields in Hawaii by residency, citizenship, and American training requirements (see Tables 17-21). The Honolulu Advertiser (November 22, 1971) described the plight of several Filipino immigrant professionals:

1. Marietta Lagud, a counselor at Waialua High School, practiced dentistry in the Philippines for 10 years before she moved to Hawaii where she had to change professions because she was not trained in an accredited American school. Although she would be willing to undergo a refresher course or internship, she said that she cannot afford to go to dental school all over again. According to her, one reason most professional immigrants decide against reentering school is that their families expect them to send money back home and thus, they would rather go to work at once.

2. Dr. C. G. Mauricio received his medical degree in Manila in 1954 and for the next three years he was a volunteer doctor in Vietnam. From 1957 to 1962, he served as a rural doctor

TABLE 15

PRIOR OCCUPATION AND NATIONALITY OF IMMIGRANTS TO HAWAII IN 1968

Occupation	Country of Origin					TOTAL*
	Philip-pines	China	Japan	Korea	Great Britain	
Employed Persons						
Professional, Technical	211	34	15	4	15	366
Farmers, Farm Managers	22	0	1	0	0	24
Magrs., Officials, Proprietors	10	13	4	4	0	41
Clerical Workers	38	17	4	2	5	99
Sales Workers	12	11	6	0	1	35
Craftsmen, Firemen	52	16	5	1	2	96
Operatives	35	20	6	0	1	69
Private Household	121	8	1	2	0	137
Service Workers	23	26	15	0	2	75
Farm Laborers	399	0	0	0	0	403
Laborers, Except Farm	98	6	1	0	0	113
Occupation not reported	10	6	1	1	1	21
TOTAL	1,031	157	59	14	27	1,479
Unemployed Persons	19	6	5	3	1	38
Not In Civilian Labor Force						
Under 14	762	115	39	40	25	1,084
Students	357	62	12	21	7	488
Housewives	676	144	168	76	18	1,198
U.S. Armed Forces	7	0	0	0	0	8
Retired	9	3	6	0	1	24
No Occupation	123	19	21	23	1	212
TOTAL	1,934	343	246	160	52	3,014
GRAND TOTAL	2,984	506	310	177	80	4,531

Source: Data are shown in "Proceedings of the Governor's Conference on Immigration, 1969," Vol. II. Data were reported to have been compiled from U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service records by Schmitt, R. C., Department of Planning and Economic Development, State of Hawaii, 1969.

*Table does not include all countries of origin; consequently, values in the TOTAL column are greater than the sums across rows.

TABLE 16

OCCUPATION OF FILIPINO IMMIGRANTS IN THE PHILIPPINES AND HAWAII

Occupation	Country			
	Philippines		Hawaii	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Menial tasks	20	4.0	130	25.8
Hard labor	12	2.4	125	24.9
Semi-professional, i.e., carpentry	20	4.0	23	4.6
Farming or Fishing	181	36.0	20	4.0
Office work or Salesman	7	1.4	10	2.0
Supervisor	4	.8	8	1.6
Management of business or Merchant	15	3.0	8	1.6
Professional	36	7.2	7	1.4
Unemployed and Students	37	7.4	19	3.8
Other	15	3.0	9	1.8
No response or Inappropriate	156	31.0	144	28.6
TOTAL	503	100.2	503	100.1

Source: Derived from data in Lasman, L., Buluran, O. J., Nolan, J., and O'Neil, L. "A Study of Attitudes of Filipino Immigrants about Hawaii." Unpublished master's thesis, University of Hawaii, 1971, pp. 40 & 42.

in the Philippines and during the next two years he was a medical worker with the Methodist Mission in Perak, Malaysia. From 1963 to 1970, he was company doctor for the Caltex Oil Company in Baru, Sumatra. After coming to Hawaii, Dr. Mauricio worked for three months as a janitor for a hamburger stand. He was unemployed at the time he was interviewed by the newspaper. In order to practice medicine in Hawaii, he would have to pass the Foreign Medical Graduates exam, serve a 3 year hospital internship and then pass the Hawaii State Medical Licensing Examination. Then, if he had acquired citizenship, he could be a doctor here. Dr. Mauricio suggests that the State utilize immigrant physicians by putting them in administrative work in alcoholism education centers or allowing them to advise their own ethnic groups in planned parenthood or health education.

3. Higinia M. Magno worked for 12 years as a licensed pharmacist in her own drugstore in the Philippines. After the pharmacy burned down she worked for several drug companies and then she went back to college and became qualified as an elementary school teacher, her occupation for the next 5 years. In Hawaii,

she has been working as a laundrywoman. She was not allowed to take the State pharmacist qualifying exam because she had not graduated from an American pharmacy school. When Higinia applied to work in hospitals (as a housekeeper), in the Model Cities program and as a teacher she was turned down because she is not a citizen.

4. Mrs. Angelita Ragasa worked 17 years as an optometrist in Laong [sic] City following her graduation from the University of the Philippines. Now she's a salesclerk at a military base store. She cannot even apply for the optometry licensing test because she did not graduate from an American college. If there were an approved school here, she would quit her job at once, to attend, she stated.

All of Hawaii's residency and citizenship requirements for government employment and occupational licensing may eventually be eliminated because they violate the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment as indicated by the following decisions:

1. On October 20, 1971, the Federal District Court for Hawaii invalidated a Hawaii Supreme Court rule requiring at least six months Hawaii residence for applicants to the bar and the law requiring a one-year waiting period for bar applicants because they violated the equal protection clause (Honolulu Advertiser, October 21, 1971; Potts v. The Honorable Justices of the Supreme Court of Hawaii, Civil #71-3403).

2. In Dunn v. Blumstein, the United States Supreme Court ruled (March 21, 1972) that State and County laws requiring any lengthy residence for voting are unconstitutional.

3. In April 1972, the State conceded in Federal Court that one-year residency requirements for doctors, veterinarians, and welfare recipients are unconstitutional (Honolulu Star-Bulletin, April 17, 1972; Montgomery v. Quisenberry et al., Civil #71-3447).

4. In April 1972, although a case brought by John Rapp (Rapp v. Lota et al., Civil #72-3509) was dismissed by the Hawaii Federal District Court, the Attorney General for Hawaii made a formal opinion that the Hawaii one-year residency requirement for voting is unconstitutional.

5. In Rapp v. Lieutenant Governor of the State of Hawaii (Civil #72-3573), the Lieutenant Governor made a formal offer (May 1972) to accept a declaratory judgment that the three-year residency requirement for candidates for political office is unconstitutional under the Dunn opinion (see No. 2) of the United States Supreme Court. In a second challenge in the case, a Federal Court agreed to a stipulation changing the

closing date of voting registration from 45 to 30 days before a primary on an experimental one-year basis (June 29, 1972).

6. On May 31, 1972, Circuit Judge Masato Doi dismissed the case of Domingo v. City & County of Honolulu (Civil #36420) on the request of the attorney for the City and the plaintiff. Mrs. Domingo, an immigrant to Hawaii from the Philippines, had been dismissed from her job with the Model Cities Outreach to the Elderly Project on the grounds that she was not a United States citizen. However, according to an agreement signed by the Deputy Corporation Counsel and Mrs. Domingo's attorney, Mrs. Domingo was a resident alien who had been a resident for at least three years in Hawaii and should not have been dismissed from her job. (Mrs. Domingo has since been reinstated.) The Deputy Corporation Counsel noted that the agreement reached in the case means an effective end to the citizenship requirement for City & County employment (Honolulu Advertiser, June 2, 1972), although the matter will have to be considered on a case by case basis.

7. In York v. State of Hawaii, S.C. #5159, the Hawaii Supreme Court affirmed (June 9, 1972) Circuit Judge Masato Doi's decision that the three-year residency requirement for City & County and State jobs was unconstitutional.

The only major remaining residency requirements are a 90-day waiting period for an abortion and a one-year waiting period for a divorce. According to Richard Okaji, Licensing Administrator, and Richard Honda, Director, of the State's Department of Regulatory Agencies, State residency requirements for occupational licensing (see Tables 17 and 19) are either no longer being enforced or they are pending review by particular regulatory boards.

The Domingo precedent (see No. 6) may make it more likely that non-citizens will be hired by the City & County of Honolulu. Prior to the case, the City & County had already exempted American nationals from the citizenship requirement for fully federally-funded jobs such as those created by the Emergency Employment Act (EEA), although the State made no such exemption. With reference to all City & County and State employment, during the recent Samoan Heritage Conference at the University of Hawaii (May 26-27, 1972) it was proposed that American "national" status be made the equivalent of citizenship status.

In the future, it is possible that the courts will declare a United States citizenship requirement for any employment, public or private, unconstitutional (except where the national interest is jeopardized) on the same grounds that they have used to eliminate durational residency requirements, namely, because such requirements deny the equal protection of the laws granted by the Constitution.

State laws which require citizenship for employment are in conflict with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 because such a requirement is tantamount to

discrimination on the basis of national origin which is specifically prohibited by the Act (see Appendix, Legal Rights of Aliens). The United States Supreme Court is presently reviewing a New York case involving the question of whether or not states can bar resident aliens from civil service jobs (Honolulu Advertiser, June 13, 1972) and a Connecticut requirement that an attorney be a U.S. citizen before being admitted to the bar for practice in the state (Honolulu Star-Bulletin, June 7, 1972). In addition, the United States Circuit Court of Appeals is reviewing a case brought by five Chinese immigrants (Mow Sun Wong v. Hampton) who contend that the federal civil service must also be open to resident aliens for employment (Honolulu Star-Bulletin, June 15, 1972).

In assessing the legal validity of residency requirements, Christensen (1968) notes that the 14th Amendment forbids any state "to deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." When a state makes classifications among persons within its jurisdiction, the test of constitutionality is whether the classification is reasonable in terms of the statute's purpose. Hawaii's citizenship requirements for State and City & County employment and for licensing in certain occupations appear to be such classifications requiring a reasonable justification. As U.S. Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter wrote (Barsky v. Board of Regents):

> It is one thing to recognize the freedom which the Constitution wisely leaves to the states in regulating the professions. It is quite another thing, however, to sanction a state's deprivation or partial destruction of a man's professional life on grounds having no possible relation to fitness, intellectual or moral, to pursue his profession.

Frankfurter's statement is illustrated by the observation of an Educational Testing Service study ("Occupational Licensing and the Supply of Non-Professional Manpower," 1969) that non-technical requirements (i.e., U.S. citizenship, state residency, minimum age, and good moral character) for entering many of the professions and occupations regulated by the states were excessive in relation to job performance standards. Thus, Miyagi (1970) recommended that the good character requirement (see Tables 17-21) for licensing in Hawaii be modified because of an absence, in some instances, of guidelines for determining character or for assessing the eligibility of applicants with criminal records. Miyagi also noted that with some occupations educational requirements are unnecessary if experience and training requirements are met, e.g., a high school education for cosmetologists. Miyagi cited the following observation of the Educational Testing Service:

> In occupations where job skills can be learned through practice, however, requiring training in 'approved' institutions and additional work experience unnecessarily prolongs the period when an individual is working at low wages if at all.

A written examination, required for 23 of the 33 licensed professions and occupations in Hawaii, may put the applicant who is an immigrant newcomer at

TABLE 17

OCCUPATIONS IN HAWAII WITH U.S. CITIZENSHIP, MORAL CHARACTER, OR OTHER REQUIREMENTS

Occupation	Section of HRS[1]	U.S. Citizenship	Hawaii Residency	Moral Character[2]	Written Exam	Education
Abstract Maker	436-1, 436-2	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	None required
Mortgage Broker & Solicitor	454-3	Yes	No	No	No	None required
Nursing Home Administrator	457B-5	Yes	No	Yes	No	High school or equivalent & accredited[3] course
Optometrist	459-6, 459-7	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	American
Physician & Surgeon	453-3, 453-4	Yes or DI[4]	No	Yes	Yes	American or foreign
Surveyor	464-8 (& LOH[5])	No	3 yrs. practice in State	Yes	Yes	Approved[3] course and/ or 3-12 years of practice
Undertakers, Embalmers, Funeral Directors	469-1	No	1 yr.	Yes	Yes	High school or equivalent and/or recognized[3] course and/ or 1-5 yrs. of practice

Sources: Hawaii Revised Statutes, Vol. 5, Titles 22-25, Chapters 401-475. State of Hawaii, 1968. Also, HRS, 1971 supplement.
"Licensed Occupations in Hawaii," Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, State of Hawaii, January, 1972.

[1] Hawaii Revised Statutes.
[2] Moral character: The applicant's "good moral character" must be corroborated with letters written and signed by 2 or more friends.
[3] "Accredited," "approved," and "recognized" are terms which usually only apply to American and Canadian educational institutions.
[4] DI = Declaration of Intention to file for citizenship.
[5] LOH = "Licensed Occupations in Hawaii" (see Sources).

TABLE 18

OCCUPATIONS IN HAWAII WITH NO CITIZENSHIP OR RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS BUT AMERICAN TRAINING AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS

Occupation	Section of HRS[1]	Moral Character[2]	Written Exam	Education
Barber & Apprentice	438-7, 438-8	Yes	Yes (or oral)	8th grade
Cosmetologist Operator	439-10, 439-12	Yes	Yes (or oral)	H.S. and grad. from registered[3] cosmetology school
Cosmetologist Instructors	439-10, 439-12	Yes	Yes (or oral)	Approved[3] education course & 3 yrs. as operator
Dental Hygenist	447-1	Yes	Yes	H.S. & American training
Fumigator	450-3, 450-5	Yes	Yes	Apprenticeship to licensed fumigator
Fumigator Apprentice	450-6	Yes	No	None required
Hearing Aid Dealer & Fitter	451A-2	Yes	Yes	Approved[3] H.S.
Osteopath	460-6	Yes	Yes	American
Pharmacist	461-5	Yes	Yes	Approved[3] pharmacy course & 1 yr. practice
Private Guard or Detective Employees	463-6	No	No	8th grade or equivalent
Psychologist	465-7	Yes	Yes	American
Real Estate Salesman	467-8	Yes	Yes	Courses in real estate
Veterinarian	471-8	Yes	Yes	American

For Sources and footnotes 1-3, see Table 17.

TABLE 19

OCCUPATIONS IN HAWAII WITH RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS
THAT MAY SOON BE ELIMINATED

Occupation	Section of HRS[1]	U.S. Citizenship	Hawaii Residency	Moral Character[2]	Written Exam	Education
C.P.A.	466-7, 466-8	Yes or DI[4]	1 yr.	Yes	Yes (may be waived[6])	American
Chiropractor	442-2	Yes	1 yr.	Yes	Yes	2 yrs. college & approved[3] course
Collection Agent	443-7	Yes or DI[4]	1 yr.	No	No	H.S. or equiv.
Contractor	444-11	No	1 yr. (1971 sup.)	Yes	No	None required
Dentist	448-9	Yes	1 yr.	Yes	Yes	American
Elevator Mechanic	448H-6 (1971 sup.)	No	1 yr.	No	Yes	None required
Masseur	452-13, 452-14	No	1 yr.	Yes	Yes (may be waived[7])	None required
Naturopath	455-3	No	1 yr.	No	Yes	American
Notary Public	456-2	No	1 yr.	No	No	
Private Detective or Guard[8]	463-6	Yes	1 yr.	No	Yes	H.S. or equiv.

For Sources and footnotes 1-4, see Table 17.

[6]The examination may be waived for a person of good moral character who is a U.S. citizen or an intended U.S. citizen who has resided in the State for one year, holds a certificate from another state, territory, or country with equivalent standards to Hawaii's, and has his own office or is employed by or in partnership with a C.P.A.

[7]Examination may be waived for a person who has complied with the requirements of a state or territory with standards equal to those for certification in Hawaii.

[8]These requirements apply to an individual or to the principle guard in a corporation. The licensee may then employ as many guards, etc., as he feels is necessary. (See Table 18.)

TABLE 20

TEMPORARY LICENSES[1] FOR MEDICAL OCCUPATIONS IN HAWAII

Occupation & Section of HRS[2]	Moral Character[3]	Education	License Required From Another Jurisdiction	Period of Temporary License	Miscellaneous Requirements
Dentist 448-12	Yes	American	No	Until next exam (exam may be taken only once)	Employed by State, County, private school, welfare center, or eleemosynary dispensary or infirmary
Dentist 448-12 (1971 Sup.)	Yes	American	From another state	3 years	Employed by the Department of Health and under supervision of licensed dentist and serve leprosy patients
Physician & Surgeon 453-3	Yes	American or Foreign	From another state or territory	18 months----- or year to year--- or during public emergency	Only in a locality with a shortage or if practice under licensed physician If employed by State or county or as intern in hospital
Physician & Surgeon 453-3.1 ('71 Sup.)	Yes		From state, country, or territory with equivalent requirements to those in Hawaii	Permanent	Internationally recognized in hyperbaric research, 3 years practice, and practice only hyperbaric medicine in connection with research
Osteopath 460-9	Yes		Same as above	Permanent	
Psychologist 465-9			From state with equal requirements	90 days & one 90-day ext.	

For Source and footnotes 1-3, see Table 21.

TABLE 21

TEMPORARY LICENSES[1] FOR NON-MEDICAL OCCUPATIONS IN HAWAII

Occupation & Section of HRS[2]	Moral Character[3]	Education	License Required From Another Jurisdiction	Period of Temporary License	Miscellaneous Requirements
Barber & Apprentice 438-10	Yes	8th grade or equivalent	From state or country with equal requirements or 5 years practice in state or country	Until next exam (can take the exam 3 times)	Work as journeyman
Cosmetology Operator & Instructor 439-16	Yes	Grad. of school with standards equal to State	From state, territory, or country with equal requirements	Until next exam	Resident of State for 60 days
Elevator Mechanic 448H-7		With skills and training not available in State	Qualified in state with equal standards		
Hearing Aid Dealer & Fitter 451A-9				1 year (may be renewed once if don't pass exam 1st year)	Under supervision of licensed person
Surveyor 464-3	Yes	Approved[4] course or 12 years experience		Until next exam	

Source: Hawaii Revised Statutes, Vol. 5, Titles 22-25, Chapters 401-475. State of Hawaii, 1968. Also, HRS, 1971 Supplement.

[1]For example, people who cannot fulfill residency or citizenship requirements or have not taken the State exam for a regular State license may get a temporary license.

[2]HRS = Hawaii Revised Statutes.

[3]Moral Character - This refers to the requirement that applicants for licenses to practice most occupations be "of good moral character." The regulatory boards for most occupations require letters to be written and signed by two or more friends of the applicant, attesting to this.

[4]"Approved" is a term that generally applies only to American and Canadian educational institutions.

Note: Some squares are blank because the appropriate information was not specified in the source.

a disadvantage because a high degree of competency in English would be necessary. Furthermore, the examination may be biased in favor of those already familiar with American culture and tradition although such background knowledge may not be related to job performance. The immigrant applicant may also be at a disadvantage where objective criteria for scoring and interpreting the examination are lacking. According to Miyagi (1970):

> . . . some regulatory boards lack written policies covering such situations as the passing scores on examinations and the value or weight given to portions of the examination in computing total passing scores, the retaking of examinations and the approval of premises (p. 39).

Although many of the regulatory boards (see Table 22) are comprised of members of the occupation or profession that is being regulated, these professionals usually lack an adequate knowledge of testing procedures, as noted in an Educational Testing Service survey ("Occupational Licensing, Protection for Whom?," 1969):

> . . . many [professional] board members lack expertise in the field of testing. As a result, the examinations vary widely in the quality and difficulty of questions. Performance ratings for practical examinations were singled out for special criticism, as they lacked standardization and grading was usually subjective.

For many of the boards, licensing requirements for the regulated occupation, coupled with eligibility requirements for membership on the board (see Table 22), effectively preclude recent immigrant professionals and laymen (including long-term immigrants who may have become U.S. citizens but still lack some of the other requirements) from being represented on the boards. However, if immigrants were included on boards, they could provide useful information in the assessment of the training and experience of recent immigrants.

Dentistry is a Hawaii licensed profession illustrative of some of the preceding criticisms of licensing requirements and procedures. The Board of Dentistry requirement that applicants for the dental licensing examination have graduated from an accredited American dental school (see Tables 19 and 20) is especially a hardship for Filipino immigrants. Hirata (1971) noted that of four ethnic groups studied (Caucasian, Japanese, Chinese and Filipino), Filipinos were the only ones with an underrepresentation of dentists. Using the telephone directory, Hirata found only six dentists with Filipino names, although according to the 1970 U.S. Census there were 93,915 Filipinos in the State.

Proponents of the licensing of foreign dental graduates note that there is a shortage of dentists in Hawaii, particularly in the rural areas. They claim that the education of most foreign dental graduates is the equivalent of an American education, as indicated by use of the same instruction in

TABLE 22

REGULATORY BOARDS OF OCCUPATIONS AND PROFESSIONS IN HAWAII

Occupational or Professional[1] Board	Section of HRS[2]	U.S. Citizenship Required	Hawaii Residency or Years of Practice in State Required	Number of Members	Required number of Professional or Occupational Members
Abstract Makers	436-2	Yes	None	3\3	None
Accountants	466-2	Yes	Resident of the State	7	7
Motor Vehicle Industry[4]	437-5	No	None	7	3\5
Barbers	438-3	No	Resident of the State & 5 yrs. of practice in State	5	5
Boxing Commission[6]	440-2	No	None	5	1\7
Cemetery[8]	441-18	No	Resident of the State	7	4\5
Chiropractic Examiners	442-3	Yes	1 yr.	3	3
Collection Agency	443-2	Yes or DI[9]	3 yrs. of practice in State	7\10	2
Contractors	444-3	No	Resident of the State	13	9\5
Cosmetology	439-3	No	5 yrs. of practice in State	5	5
Dental Examiners	448-5	Yes	5 yrs. of practice in State	7	7

TABLE 22 [CONTINUED]

Occupational or Professional[1] Board	Section of HRS[2]	U.S. Citizenship Required	Hawaii Residency or Years of Practice in State Required	Number of Members	Required number of Professional or Occupational Members
Electricians & Plumbers	448E-2	No	None	7	4[5]
Elevator Mechanics	448H-3	No	1 yr.	5	3[5]
Hearing Aid Dealers & Fitters	451A-3	No	Resident of State	7	3
Massage	452-4	Yes	None	3	3
Medical Examiners	453-5	Yes or DI[9]	None	7	7
Naturopathy	455-4	No	1 yr.	3	3
Nursing	457-3	Yes	Resident of State	7	7
Nursing Home Administrators	457B-4	Yes	None	7[10]	2
Opticians, Dispensing	458-2	No	None	3	3
Optometry	459-3	Yes	1 yr.	3	3
Osteopathic Examiners	460-4	No	None	3	3
Pharmacy	461-2	No	5 yrs. of practice in State	5	5
Private Guards & Detectives	463-2	Yes	1 yr.	3	1[11]

TABLE 22 [CONTINUED]

Occupational or Professional[1] Board	Section of HRS[2]	U.S. Citizenship Required	Hawaii Residency or Years of Practice in State Required	Number of Members	Required number of Professional or Occupational Members
Professional Engineers, Architects, & Surveyors	464-6	No	3 yrs.	14	11
Psychologists	465-4	No	None	7	5[5]
Real Estate Commission	467-3	Yes	3 yrs.	7	4
Veterinary Examiners	471-3	No	5 yrs. of practice in State	5	5

Sources: Hawaii Revised Statutes, Vol. 5, Titles 22-25, Chapters 401-475. State of Hawaii, 1968.
"Licensed Occupations in Hawaii," Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, State of Hawaii, January 1972.
Miyagi, A. Y. "Professional and Occupational Regulatory Boards and Commissions of the State of Hawaii." Legislative Reference Bureau, University of Hawaii, December 1970, Table III, pp. 65-75.

[1]Gellhorn (in Miyagi, 1970, p. 3) defines a profession as requiring: (1) certification in a specified area of knowledge, (2) commitment to an established code of ethics, and (3) service to the community and mankind above and beyond pecuniary profit.
[2]HRS = Hawaii Revised Statutes.
[3]This Board is comprised of "the judge of the land court, the registrar of conveyances, and the attorney general..." (HRS, § 436-3).
[4]The Board regulates automobile dealers and salesmen.
[5]The other members must be persons not connected with the occupation or profession.
[6]The Commission licenses boxers.
[7]This member must be a member of the Hawaii branch of the U.S. Amateur Athletic Union.
[8]The Board licenses cemetery salesmen.
[9]DI = Declaration of Intention to file for citizenship.
[10]Two of the seven members must fulfill the citizenship and residency requirements; all the members of the other boards must fulfill them.
[11]Of the remaining members, one must be a police chief of one of the counties, and the other must be a layman (private citizen).

English textbooks as found in American dental schools. Furthermore, it is noted that the medical profession allows foreign graduates to take the medical licensure examination without requiring an American degree although there are other requirements, i.e., hospital internship, graduate education, or several years of institutional training.

Opponents of the licensing of foreign dental graduates claim that the removal of the American degree requirement would lower the standards of dentistry in Hawaii because the foreign graduate either lacks adequate technical training or an understanding of the ethics and philosophy of American dentistry (Morimoto, 1971). On the one hand it is claimed that the written examination is not an adequate measure of the competency of the foreign dental graduate, whereas on the other it is maintained that training in American schools will improve the foreign graduate's English language skills so that he will be better prepared for the examination. It seems obvious that if the examination is not a valid measure of one's dental proficiency, then other adequate measures should be developed which do not arbitrarily discriminate against the foreign graduate.

According to a Legislative Reference Bureau study (Morimoto, 1971), there are at least 17 foreign dental graduates in Hawaii who are licensed to practice in their country of origin, however, they are ineligible for licensure in Hawaii because they do not have a D.D.S. or D.M.D. from an American dental college. It was recommended that foreign dental graduates with graduate degrees from an accredited school of dentistry (e.g., a Masters degree or certificate in dental education) should be eligible for licensure. Moreover, it was stated that the requirement of an American degree might be eliminated (a) if a licensure examination is designed to adequately test dental competency, (b) if new guidelines are developed to better evaluate foreign dental graduates, and (c) if a suitable internship program is developed.

In contrast to the high degree of underemployment and misplaced employment among recent Filipino immigrants, for Samoans the key problem seems to be unemployment. The results of the 1971 Survey of Oahu Samoans indicated that only 64% of Samoan men and 32% of Samoan women over 18 years of age were employed ("Report of the State Immigration Service Center," 1972). Unfortunately, the results of the survey did not distinguish between immigrants vs. non-immigrants (i.e., Samoan-born vs. Hawaii-born persons) or between long-term immigrants vs. recent immigrants. Consequently, unemployment among recent Samoan immigrants may differ significantly from the reported percentages.

Studies of Samoans in Hawaii conducted in the mid-1960s indicated that Samoans were predominantly employed as "blue-collar" workers with few in business or professional occupations (see Table 23).

In Nanakuli, Yost (1965) found the most frequently reported occupation for Samoan men to be that of laborer, particularly in construction work. The women were predominantly employed as laundry workers and waitresses. Six Samoans, formerly teachers in Samoa, who had changed their occupation because they did not meet Hawaii certification requirements were identified.

Wage rates for Samoans in the Palama area in 1966 are given in Table 24.

For the 45 Samoan households interviewed in Palama, the number of families by per capita income category is indicated in Table 25.

The 44 Samoan families surveyed in the Kalihi Valley Housing Project (Ala'ilima, 1966) also reported low wages (usually less than $2.00 per hour) and low per capita income. For families of 7, the range of monthly income was $200 to $525 per month, with an average monthly income of $351 for a family of 7.5 members, or a monthly per capita income of $46.80 (or $561.60 per year).

At the previously mentioned Samoan Heritage Series Conference, local attorney John Alexander, who has conducted legal work in behalf of Samoan clients, mentioned some difficulties involved in employing Samoans, while noting that his observations were impressionistic and applicable to only a minority of Samoans:

> There have been some cases of a Samoan being hired and the whole family showing up for work.
>
> Some Samoan businesses may be run by Samoan family chiefs (matais) who employ family members with no set wages other than what the chief gives them. Federal authorities have stated that they will allow this to continue with biological relatives but not with more distant relatives.
>
> Sometimes Samoans stay away from work too long upon the death of a relative or they absent themselves from work upon the death of a very distant relative.
>
> Samoans sometimes undergo periods of sulking or moroseness (similar to what Hawaiians call "nuha") when they don't want to communicate with anybody. At such times, other Samoans understand the situation and leave them alone until they feel better again.

TABLE 23

OCCUPATION OF SAMOANS LIVING IN PALAMA

Occupation	Number
Light machine (presser, dishwasher)	23
Heavy machine (truck, bulldozer, crane)	16
Unskilled laborer	13
Skilled trade (usually "helper" for carpenter, electrician, etc.)	8
Clerical	6
Custodial (janitor, guard)	3
Selling (store clerk)	2
TOTAL	71

Source: Original data are found in Ala'ilima, F. C., and Ala'ilima, V. J. "Samoan Pilot Project: A Preliminary Report." Unpublished report of the Honolulu Community Action Program, Sinclair Library, University of Hawaii, 1966b, p.12.

TABLE 24

WAGES RECEIVED BY SAMOANS IN PALAMA

Wage Rate	Number of Wage Earners
$3.50-4.00	1
3.00-3.50	7
2.50-3.00	5
2.00-2.50	17
1.50-2.00	12
1.25-1.50	29
TOTAL	71

Source: Based on data in Ala'ilima, F. C., and Ala'ilima, V. J. "Samoan Pilot Project: A Preliminary Report." Unpublished report of the Honolulu Community Action Program, Sinclair Library, University of Hawaii, 1966b, p.11.

TABLE 25

PER CAPITA INCOME OF SAMOANS IN PALAMA

Annual Per Capita Income	Number of families
$ 0.- 500.	8
500.-1,000.	15
More than 1,000.	22
TOTAL	45

Source: Based on data in Ala'ilima, F. C., and Ala'ilima, V.J. "Samoan Pilot Project: A Preliminary Report." Unpublished report of the Honolulu Community Action Program, Sinclair Library, University of Hawaii, 1966b, p.11.

Housing Problems

Two recent studies indicate that housing is more frequently reported to be a serious problem by immigrants than other problem areas (see Tables 11 and 30). Table 30 shows that 53.8% of the Filipino sample reported housing to be their most serious problem. It is interesting to note in Table 11 that housing may not be the most serious problem for all immigrant groups in Hawaii, e.g., the Chinese and Japanese samples reported language to be their most serious problem.

The results of the following surveys suggest that many Filipino and Samoan immigrants are living under high density conditions:

1. A recent survey by Lim (1971) showed that only 12% of 100 Filipino immigrant households in Kalihi-Waena and Kalihi-Uka were single-family households. The remaining 88% were multi-family households, with an average (mean) of 3.4 families living in each household. The sample was comprised of 33% recent immigrants (with less than 5 years residency), 61% naturalized citizens, and 6% resident aliens with more than 5 years residency. According to Lim (1971), a partial explanation for the crowded homes is a reluctance among Filipinos to live in high-rise apartments or in crowded housing projects with non-Filipinos (fear of conflict with other ethnic groups was suggested as a factor accounting for this reluctance).

2. Results of the 1971 Oahu Samoan Survey show an average (mean) Samoan household size of 10.4 persons ("Report of the State Immigration Service Center," 1972, p. 36), in which the household usually included members of the extended family.

3. A 1965 study of 65 Samoan households in Nanakuli-Makaha revealed household sizes ranging from 2 to 15 persons, with a median of approximately 6.5 persons (see Yost, 1965, p. 32).

4. An earlier survey of 45 Samoan households in the Palama area (Ala'ilima & Ala'ilima, 1966b) reported that 23 of the families expected to move in the future, with the reasons given for moving being overcrowded conditions (11 families), too expensive housing (4 families), too noisy or "undesirable" (3 families), and notice to move from public housing (4 families). The authors concluded that dwelling size and cost were of greater concern to the Samoans of Palama than the condition of the housing:

> Few families seemed concerned about the physical condition of their dwellings, but many were vocally disturbed about high rent and small size both in housing and non-housing. More 5 and 6 bedroom houses seemed needed (p. 1).

For many Samoans, large households are a natural consequence of the living arrangements of the Samoan extended family, although it is often

difficult to find sufficient space for such large families in Hawaii. Insufficient space is an especially acute problem for recent immigrants because they tend to move into high density areas such as Kalihi-Palama.

What are some of the indications of immigrant housing problems within the context of public and private housing?

A. Public Housing. Given the low income and housing problems of many recent immigrants, we would expect many of them to be living in public housing units for low income families, which currently total 4,584 units on Oahu. However, prior to 1969, Hawaii Housing Authority (HHA) regulations required that an alien applicant have resided in Hawaii for 3 years in order to be placed on the waiting list for such housing, which would have excluded most recent immigrants. Although there no longer is such a requirement, it may still be thought to be in effect by some members of the community. Even without the residency requirement, long waiting lists preclude recent immigrants from readily utilizing existing subsidized housing. Another obstacle preventing immigrants from accepting housing is a belief that by doing so they become public charges and, as such, either risk deportation or loss of eligibility to become naturalized citizens. In fact, however, there is no official policy or legal basis for such a belief. A final obstacle, which results from the norms of some immigrant groups, is the loss of social esteem felt to result from the acceptance of public housing (particularly a problem for Filipino immigrants).

One indication of the housing needs of Samoans is the fact that Samoans composed 8.0% of the family heads in Hawaii Housing Authority projects in 1971 (see Table 26). The value of 8.0% is especially significant considering that Samoans compose only about 1% of the total Hawaii population.

Many housing problems of Samoans living in public housing appear to stem from a conflict between the Samoan extended family (which is typically large and often includes different relatives over time) and HHA regulations. For instance, a management official at Kuhio Park Terrace noted that a major problem at the housing project was that unauthorized persons tended to move in with the Samoans. She reported that frequent requests have been made for more space to accomodate children from Samoa who have been sent to Hawaii for schooling (Honolulu Star-Bulletin, December 1, 1971).

The 1966 survey of 43 Samoan families living in Kalihi Valley Housing also found that housing problems may occur when adapting the extended family system of the Samoans to the American cultural setting (Ala'ilima, 1966, p. 7):

> The greatest problem seems to spring from the fact that American housing arrangements are not designed for extended families in which a chief is considered able for sheltering and supporting any kin who apply. This is not too difficult in Samoa where

TABLE 26

ETHNIC BACKGROUND OF HEADS OF FAMILIES FOR HAWAII HOUSING AUTHORITY PROJECTS FOR 1971

Ethnic Background	Women		Men		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Hawaiian	1,432	33.1	635	23.0	2,067	29.1
Filipino	642	14.8	696	25.2	1,338	18.9
Caucasian	832	19.2	486	17.6	1,318	18.6
Japanese	536	12.4	272	9.8	808	11.4
Samoan	310	7.2	259	9.4	569	8.0
Puerto Rican	302	7.0	199	7.2	501	7.1
Chinese	100	2.3	88	3.2	188	2.7
Korean	76	1.8	22	.8	98	1.4
Negro	33	.8	52	1.9	85	1.2
Other	66	1.5	55	2.0	121	1.7
TOTAL	4,329	100.1	2,764	100.1	7,093	100.1

Source: Based upon data in "Hawaii Housing Authority Composite Report, July 1, 1970 to June 30, 1971," Hawaii Housing Authority, Honolulu, Hawaii, p. 23.
Note: Part-Hawaiian were classified as Hawaiian, mixed Caucasian were classified as non-Caucasian, and mixed were classified by father's background.

houses are open-sided, relatives sleep side by side on mats and newcomers can immediately assist on the family plantation. But it is not simple in America. Kalihi housing units have a maximum of 5 bedrooms, most being 3 and 4, and there is a regulation that not more than 2 adults or 3 children of the same sex can occupy each of these.

Samoan family membership changes constantly. Among the people interviewed 18 expected new members in the near future, and 10 departures were imminent. When new kin appear seeking shelter, a Kalihi family head is in a difficult position. Either he is forced to refuse them which causes a serious reflection on family loyalty, or is forced to break housing regulations.

Although rent is adjusted to family income and nominal by American standards, it is a problem to people used to unpaid housing in Samoa. They had questions as to why there was a fine for late rent, why rent day cannot coincide with pay day, why electricity over a certain amount is charged, why units

> are not the same, and why they cannot raise pets and bananas. Most Samoans actually understand such regulations, but have some difficulty accepting and meeting them.

A program aimed at alleviating some of the housing problems of Samoan immigrants should seek an accomodation between the extended family unit and the institutional and legal requirements of Hawaii. The Director of the Department of Social Services and Housing has acknowledged that Hawaii's housing policies do not fit the Polynesian way of living (Honolulu Star-Bulletin, December 3, 1971). He noted that Samoans (and Hawaiians) are going to continue to double up, and even triple up. But he observed that the extended family system is not against the law, although it results in the violation of many State, Federal, and City & County regulations. Perhaps the regulations should be reexamined, he commented.

> I am more concerned about family solidarity than some minor health risks. We make no allowances for natural family solidarity. The regulations mitigate against it. And before these regulations came about the Japanese and Chinese families of Hawaii did the same thing (extended family living). And they've come out just fine.

B. Private Housing. The Samoan Church Village at Nanakuli may serve as an example of an effectively functioning community based on the extended family system (described as of 1965). The Village contains 10 small-frame houses in poor condition which are situated on 1.3 acres of land. It was purchased in 1964 by a congregation of the Samoan Church in Hawaii, which is affiliated with the London Missionary Society. Sixteen families participate in community activities, although only 10 of the families actually live at the Village site (Ala'ilima & Ala'ilima, 1966b; Yost, 1965).

The community affairs of the Village are administered by a board of directors and a president. The board is comprised of the 16 family heads who are addressed in the chiefly language and treated ceremonially as matais, or family chiefs. The pastor of the church is the president. The church is the most important social organization in the Village and everyone is required to be a member. Two traditional Samoan organizations exist, one consisting of a group of young men who are not family heads and the other a Women's Committee which periodically inspects the households and concerns itself with sanitation and baby care. Although individual family heads are responsible for the condition of their own homes, there is considerable cooperation among families concerning house repairs.

Traditional Samoan ceremonial practices and the extended family system are found in the Village. The board of directors enforces certain rules of Samoan culture, such as an evening curfew when prayers are being held by the Village and punishment for drunkenness. The benefits derived from these traditional arrangements have been aptly described by Ala'ilima & Ala'ilima, (1966b):

> Several women mentioned that one of the chief advantages of living in the Samoan Village is that they can raise their children "in a Samoan way." They particularly referred to "fa'aalaalo" (respect and courteous conduct). Corporal punishment is a common and accepted form of discipline. They felt their children were better behaved and controlled than other local children as a result. . . .
>
> All the village families were intimately acquainted and mutually dependent which was not true in public housing. Police intervention has been low in Nanakuli since the village council handles its own disciplinary problems, but several families do receive welfare assistance. Motivation and morale seems high in the community especially in the construction of the new church. As one woman said she lost that "terrible lonesomeness" when she moved out here and it was well worth driving 40 miles to work each day just to be with people she knew and understood. Other Samoan residents expressed particular satisfaction in owning land of their own.
>
> The Nanakuli Samoan Village is closer to traditional Samoan organization and practice than any Samoan group surveyed. This type of organization seems to provide a congenial atmosphere for Samoans who still find their security in close personal and community living and are not particularly concerned with their economic "standard of living." This Samoan type social organization does not seem to prohibit modifications to American circumstances. It only means that modifications are made by the entire group not just isolated individuals (appendix C, emphasis added).

Ala'ilima & Ala'ilima noted that Samoans who find security in income, savings, and property will find a Western-style organization more satisfactory than the traditional Samoan arrangement. As several surveys have shown (Forster, 1954; Yost, 1965; Ala'ilima & Ala'ilima, 1966b), some Samoans find the extended family system burdensome. Tensions within the Samoan community have been reported when matais have acted as representatives for the total Samoan community. In actuality, the matais are spokesmen for only a segment of the Samoan population.

In view of the preceding considerations, a housing program should be able to accommodate extended families. For instance, a 35-acre Samoan-style village containing 15 to 25 families was recently proposed to the Lieutenant Governor by a group of Samoan pastors and chiefs (Ala'ilima, Fau'olo, et al., 1972). It is likely that the extended family organization would be preferred by many recent immigrants. When such a preference is indicated, housing regulations might be modified to allow for extended family living arrangements during an initial adjustment period. This would utilize the extended family as a transitional structure to help prevent early problems of intercultural adjustment.

Two Hawaii housing communities, one Samoan ("Nakatani Housing") and the other Filipino ("Ota Camp"), have recently undergone severe housing crises which are described in the following paragraphs:

Nakatani Housing. Many of the Samoans in Nanakuli live behind a row of business offices and shops in some of the 116 dilapidated wooden houses known as "Nakatani housing" (the residential and business property is owned by H. Nakatani Enterprises, Inc.). Although persons from other ethnic groups also live in the homes which rent for $48.00 to $65.00 per month (Honolulu Advertiser, November 12, 1971), the housing is viewed as containing a "Samoan community" by many because of the substantial numbers of Samoans living there (who occupy approximately 40% of the units, according to manager Ken Nakano). Samoans living in or near the housing and other observers report that many of the Samoan families (or their members) there have recently moved to Hawaii (i.e., since 1965), although some of these newcomers may have first lived elsewhere in Hawaii before moving into the homes. Thus, the crisis faced by the "Nakatani housing" residents is illustrative of one kind of housing problem which may be encountered by recent immigrants to Hawaii.

In October 1971, all of the families received notice that they would have to move so that a shopping center could be built. To meet the sudden emergency, the Waianae Model Cities Housing Task Force in cooperation with other agencies helped to relocate 36 of the families, 15 of which were Samoan. Many of these 36 families were living in the 35 buildings (soon to be demolished) on the front portion of the property. The families in the remaining 81 houses on the back portion were later informed that they would be allowed to remain there for a year while they were finding other quarters, however the problem of their relocation remains an urgent one. According to manager Ken Nakano and a Nanakuli employment official (who is a Samoan), some of the Samoans have relocated to houses on the back portion of the property, to nearby property in the area, to Waipahu, and even to the Samoan Church Village.

The Samoans from "Nakatani housing" have had difficulty in finding new homes because of a lack of low cost housing elsewhere and a reluctance of landlords to rent to Samoans. Apparently many landlords believe that Samoan families tend to quickly overcrowd a unit as relatives and friends move in. Also, some landlords believe that Samoans do not pay their rent. While acknowledging that Samoans and members of other ethnic groups in "Nakatani housing" sometimes did not pay their rent, Attorney R. LeClair of the Waianae Comprehensive Legal Services office (who has assisted with the efforts to relocate the Samoan families at "Nakatani housing") notes that this was made possible by management's failure, at times, to collect the rent. LeClair contends that the lesson of the "Nakatani housing" crisis is that Act 166 (Hawaii Revised Statutes, 1971 Supplement, Sections 111-1 through 111-12), which provides monetary assistance for relocation costs and replacement housing for tenants and other persons displaced by State or county acquisition of real property in the public interest, should be extended to cover persons displaced by private development projects.

Ota Camp. On November 23, 1971, the Honolulu Advertiser carried a feature article describing the living conditions of immigrants in Waipahu and other areas of Oahu. About a month later, the inhabitants of a group of Waipahu shacks ("Ota Camp") were given eviction notices. A letter from the City & County to the property owner ordering him to connect the 60 shanties (which rent for $20.00 to $40.00 per month) at the "Camp" to the sewer system apparently triggered the eviction. Members of the families living there (a total of about 109 persons) said that they could not find replacement housing at low rent. In turn, a City & County official reported that the intent of the City & County was not to imply that eviction was the only solution (Honolulu Advertiser, January 14, 1972).

The "Camp," which has diminished in size over the years, once provided housing for workers at the former Waipahu Plantation. The residents have organized and protested the eviction. According to their spokesman, P. Tagalog, nearly all of the residents in the area are recent Filipino immigrants and about half of them do not speak English (Honolulu Advertiser, January 14, 1972). As described by Tagalog: "Our people here are working with eight or more children. The rest are old men in their 80's who are living on pensions. Where else can they live for $30?" The eviction notice caught the residents by surprise. One man went shouting from house to house telling the people about the eviction while another man suffered a fatal heart attack after trying to find a new place to live.

De Leon (1972) described the "Camp" as follows:

> The Camp is very much like the small barrios (villages) that dot the countryside of the Philippines. The houses were built by the people who live in them. They put in their own electricity, and dug their own cesspools. Their neat gardens grow a large variety of fruits and vegetables and beautiful flowers are everywhere.
>
> What strikes the newcomer the most is the orderliness of the camp. Each lawn and garden is neatly manicured. The houses are clean inside and out and even the loose boards that serve as walkways from the dirt street to the individual houses are spotlessly clean.
>
> The life style here is the same as in the Philippines.

A standard public housing project, even if available to the "Camp" residents, would probably be unsatisfactory because it would disrupt their close-knit "natural" community. As one resident stated (De Leon, 1972): "We don't want to live in concrete high-rises where people don't say hello to each other. I lived in the Palolo Public housing for awhile and hated every minute of it." According to the same account, the residents have 4 objectives:

1. That the community be allowed to stay together, preserving its style of living. As Tagalog explained it: "We are

> Pilipinos and we are not ashamed of it. Our people like to raise their own vegetables. The gardens are needed because the vegetables are too expensive to buy. Here we can grow everything we need for our Pilipino food. We have no drug addicts, no drunks, no crime, and no dropouts. The government should try to protect such a law-abiding community as ours."

2. That the residents not be relocated in tall apartment buildings.

3. That they not be relocated to somewhere where there is a probability of again being evicted.

4. That Amity Waipahu, Inc., or Amity Developers, Inc. (the present owner), not be their landlord.

The preceding objectives might be attained by supporting and developing a village with barrio-style houses, in which the essential style of living is Filipino. Such a community could contribute both to Hawaii's tradition of ethnic diversity and to Hawaii's economy, as do the Ulu Mau (Hawaiian) Village and the Polynesian Cultural Center. The "Ota Camp" residents might provide an enthusiastic nucleus for such a community, so long as they have a major role in developing and maintaining the community.

Health Problems

Health problems of immigrants were summarized in the "Proceedings of the Governor's Conference on Immigration, 1969," Vol. II, (1970) in the following manner:

> There are indications that most immigrants bring with them a variety of health problems. These range from poor vision to typhoid. Screening in the country of origin varies in its quality, and "point of entry" contact, screening and follow-up is less than adequate. Many of the problems are not discovered until they become serious in nature. Of particular concern are those communicable diseases which can affect the local community as well as the immigrant "carrier," i.e., tuberculosis, and typhoid.
>
> Medical care costs in Hawaii are high. Immigrant income is usually low initially, and the greater part of it devoted to food and shelter, leaving little to cover the cost of medical care. Only one pre-paid health plan is available immediately (Kaiser), others have a waiting period of approximately six months between opening dates.
>
> Free health services are not known to the great majority of immigrants, and when known are not utilized because of socio-cultural factors.

There were 270 new cases of active tuberculosis in Hawaii for 1970. These active cases were proportionately much greater for the foreign-born than for either the Hawaii-born or the mainland-born (see Table 27). Table 27 shows that the foreign-born accounted for 64.8% (175 persons) of the active cases, whereas the Hawaii-born and mainland-born accounted for only 23.3% and 4.8%, respectively.

It is evident from Table 27 that new cases of tuberculosis are most commonly found among the recently arrived foreign-born, with those persons with less than 1 year's residence in Hawaii accounting for 32.6% of the total active cases. It seems reasonable to assume that most of those persons labeled foreign-born are also legally classified as immigrants; foreign students and other non-immigrant aliens probably account for relatively few active cases.

The frequency of newly reported tuberculosis cases for 1970, according to ethnic background, is shown in Table 28. The Filipino population ranked first with 103 active cases (38.1%) and the Japanese second with 48 cases (17.8%). The data in Tables 27 and 28 suggest that recent Filipino immigrants are accounting for a disproportionately large number of newly reported cases of tuberculosis.

Besides tuberculosis, more recent information indicates that leprosy and hookworm infestation may be more prevalent among recent immigrants than long-term residents. New cases of leprosy in Hawaii from 1966-70 have been disproportionately a problem for the foreign-born (see Table 29). Most of the

TABLE 27

NEWLY REPORTED ACTIVE CASES OF TUBERCULOSIS IN HAWAII FOR 1970 AND PLACE OF BIRTH

Place of Birth	Number	Percent
Foreign-Born	175	64.8
<1 Year residence in Hawaii	88	32.6
<2 Years residence in Hawaii	10	3.7
<5 Years residence in Hawaii	13	4.8
>5 Years residence in Hawaii	64	23.7
Hawaii-Born	63	23.3
Mainland-Born	13	4.8
Unknown	19	7.0
TOTAL	270	99.9

Source: Based upon data in "Statistical Report, 1970." Department of Health, State of Hawaii, 1972, p. 100.
Note: < denotes "less than," > denotes "more than."

TABLE 28

NEWLY REPORTED CASES OF ACTIVE TUBERCULOSIS BY ETHNIC BACKGROUND FOR HAWAII IN 1970

Ethnic Background	Number	Percent
Filipino	103	38.1
Japanese	48	17.8
Caucasian	26	9.6
Chinese	25	9.3
Hawaiian	16	5.9
Korean	15	5.6
Part-Hawaiian	7	2.6
Puerto Rican	1	.4
Other	29	10.7
TOTAL	270	100.0

Source: Derived from data in "Statistical Report, 1970." Department of Health, State of Hawaii, 1972, p. 107.

new cases have been found among foreign-born Filipinos (55.5%) and foreign-born Samoans (15.3%), with Hawaii-born persons accounting for only 26.4% of the total. Unfortunately, Table 29 does not indicate the date of entry to Hawaii for the foreign-born; thus, the frequency of leprosy for recent immigrants vs. long-term immigrants cannot be determined.

TABLE 29

NEW CASES OF LEPROSY BY COUNTRY OF BIRTH, 1966-70

Country of Birth	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1966-70	
						Number	Percent
Philippines	6	6	12	4	12	40	55.5
Hawaii	5	4	5	4	1	19	26.4
Samoa	2	2	3	1	3	11	15.3
India	1	0	0	0	0	1	1.4
Tahiti	0	1	0	0	0	1	1.4
TOTAL	14	13	20	9	16	72	100.0

Source: Derived from data in "Statistical Report, 1970." Department of Health, State of Hawaii, 1972, p. 99.

There has been a recent increase in reported hookworm infestations in Hawaii, as shown in the following figures: 1966 = 4 cases, 1967 = 20 cases, 1968 = 22 cases, 1969 = 27 cases, 1970 = 118 cases ("Statistical Report, 1970," 1972, p. 91). According to the Department of Health report, the increase in hookworm infestations (ancylostomiasis) is "largely traceable to newly arrived persons from the various western pacific regions" (p. 90).

The study of recent Filipino immigrants by Lasman et al. (1971) reported that only 4.1% of the sample ranked health as their most serious problem (see Table 30). Among the five problem areas listed on the survey, health was chosen by the fewest number of immigrants. The data in Table 30 suggest that from the viewpoint of the Filipino immigrant, health is usually seen as a less severe problem than housing, employment, social, or language difficulties.

The findings of the Lasman et al. study should be interpreted with caution, however, because health problems may not be reported for the purpose of "saving face" or to avoid risking possible deportation as a consequence of an unreported medical problem at the time of entry. Moreover, in many instances the immigrant may not realize that he has a medical problem which should be treated. In fact, the concept of a health problem is determined by one's cultural background. For instance, throughout Southeast Asia there is a high incidence of liver and intestinal parasite infestation; however, abdominal pain and other symptoms of parasitic origin are frequently not considered abnormal and are tolerated

so long as they do not incapacitate the carrier. In Thailand, for example, one of the authors has observed that recurrent stomachaches due to parasites, which in the United States would be considered symptomatic of an "illness," are often considered to be a normal condition by villagers. If the pain is troublesome enough, resort will be made to local remedies or to drugs which are easily purchased over the counter without a prescription.

TABLE 30

SELF-REPORTS OF MOST SERIOUS PROBLEMS FOR FILIPINO IMMIGRANTS

Problem (Most Serious)	Number	Percent
Housing	235	53.8
Employment	86	19.7
Social Adjustment	50	11.4
Communication (Language)	48	11.0
Health	18	4.1
TOTAL	437	100.0

Source: Based upon data in Lasman, L., Buluran, O. J., Nolan, J. and O'Neil, L. "A Study of Attitudes of Filipino Immigrants About Hawaii." Unpublished master's thesis, University of Hawaii, 1971, p. 49.

Aside from the data concerning tuberculosis, leprosy, and hookworms, there are few available statistics to indicate that immigrants suffer unduly from health problems. Agmata's (1970) "Final Report on the Program of Health Education of Immigrants" presents many areas in which health information would benefit the recent immigrants. In many instances, however, the information would be of value for the non-immigrant as well as the immigrant, e.g., ways to prevent high blood pressure or heart disease. As a result of Agmata's efforts, several health pamphlets concerning such topics as family planning and tuberculosis have been prepared in the Chinese, Japanese, Samoan, Tagalog, and Ilocano languages. These pamphlets have been available to immigrants at the Honolulu Airport, State Immigration Service Center, Department of Health, and other agencies.

In some cases, what may appear to be a health problem is, in fact, essentially an intercultural problem. For example, some Samoans (living in Samoa) are carriers of headlice without a social stigma being placed on the carrier. However, a carrier of headlice in Hawaii would be given a derogatory label such as "dirty" by his neighbors and the community. It seems likely that the difficulties resulting from being labeled "dirty" by one's neighbors would greatly outweigh any illnesses that might be traced to the lice.

Intercultural Problems

A recent article by Brein and David (1971) reviewed the research literature dealing with the adjustment problems of the sojourner. In general, both the sojourner and immigrant tend to undergo adjustment difficulties shortly after entering a foreign culture, which is followed by a gradual increase in adjustment over a period of several months. The immigrant's decrease in adjustment is sometimes referred to as the "culture shock" experience. According to David (1972), poor intercultural adjustment may be viewed as resulting from two types of punishment that the immigrant experiences in the new culture; namely, (a) the removal of reinforcers or rewards and (b) the presentation of aversive conditions, i.e., events that are painful (see David, 1971, 1972, for a more thorough discussion of intercultural adjustment).

Intercultural problems are an inherent aspect of the problem areas previously discussed in this paper. In fact, one's definition of what constitutes a problem and one's scheme for classifying problems (i.e., classifying problems according to education, language, employment, housing, health, and intercultural) is culturally determined. For instance, in Samoa it is usually not a problem for a person to be lacking in English fluency, to be lacking a high school diploma, or to live in a large family household. However, such conditions can result in serious adjustment problems for the Samoan who is living in the context of the American or Hawaii culture.

Most of the information directly relating to the intercultural problems of recent immigrants in Hawaii deals with either Filipinos or Samoans, which is also true of the information bearing on the other problem areas.

In the health survey of Filipino immigrants by Agmata (1970), she concluded that a program of health education should include consideration of cultural factors, aptly described in the following manner:

> The point that bears some emphasis, perhaps, is that the laboring immigrants come from either barrios or villages and provinces where old cultural practices in the treatment of diseases still exist. . . . They would resent anyone who would impose on them anything new that may violate their beliefs and practices. Understanding their culture is extremely important (p. 30).

Consistent with Agmata's report about the origin of Filipino immigrants, Lasman et al. (1971) found that most recent Filipino immigrants came from the Ilocos region (see Table 31). Table 31 shows that 413 (82.1%) of the sample reported that they came from the Ilocos area.

Rather surprisingly, Lasman et al. also found that the sample of 503 Filipino immigrants reported no increased difficulty in disciplining their children in Hawaii. In fact, 183 (36.4%) reported that children are easier to discipline in Hawaii than in the Philippines, whereas 120 (23.9%) reported that children are more difficult to discipline in Hawaii, with 162 (32.2%) reporting that children are about the same to discipline in Hawaii, and 38 (7.6%) not responding to the question.

DO NOT FILM

TABLE 31

ORIGIN OF RECENT FILIPINO IMMIGRANTS

Region	Number	Percent
Ilocos	413	82.1
Pangasinan	48	9.5
Tagalog (Includes Manila)	20	4.0
Visayan	14	2.8
Other	6	1.2
No Response	2	.4
TOTAL	503	100.0

Source: Data are shown in Lasman, L., Buluran, O. J., Nolan, J., and O'Neil, L. "A Study of Attitudes of Filipino Immigrants About Hawaii." Unpublished master's thesis, University of Hawaii, 1971, p. 42.

Unfortunately, there have been no systematic studies designed to determine some of the more pressing intercultural problems of the recent Filipino immigrant. However, perhaps various anecdotal statements and impressionistic observations by immigrants and by those persons who have been in contact with immigrants will help us to focus on some of the intercultural problems of Filipinos. For example, in the Meeting of the Subcommittee on Health & Welfare during the 1969 "Governor's Conference on Immigration," Filipino respondents reported the following intercultural problems ("Proceedings of the Governor's Conference on Immigration," Vol. II, 1970):

> Fear and pride coupled with difficulties in communication hamper their efforts to seek assistance with problems.
>
> There is a general lack of information about services available.
>
> There is a cultural pattern of taking someone with them who "has influence" when seeking services.
>
> A major problem of getting people to the service.
>
> There is no "advocate" at the airport--the first place they need help. . . . there is a need for someone who can assist "outside the gate." (An immigrant service worker at the airport has described the early arrival problems of immigrants, see Hernando-Hill, 1972.)

Other problems of Filipino immigrants have been described in notes collected by Cunningham (1972), based upon her field observations and interviews with immigrants and persons associated with immigrants. Some of the problems for recent Filipino immigrants mentioned by Cunningham follow:

Teachers reported that immigrant children who learn standard English may be ridiculed by children who speak the Island dialect (i.e., pidgin English).

Recent immigrant children are frequently called "P.I.s" by Hawaii-born Filipino children.

A police officer reported that an increasing number of recent immigrant children have been taking knives to school to protect themselves from non-immigrant children.

Several mothers of immigrant children reported that their sons have been ridiculed by their peers because they were not circumcised--circumcision is uncommon in the Philippines. Also, the children were ridiculed for their refusal to eat some American foods which are a part of the school lunch program, e.g., refusal to eat salads.

Waiting for one's turn in line at public events is not accepted practice in the Philippines, and may result in initial problems for the recent immigrant.

Consumer frauds have been fairly common among recent immigrants. Filipinos have been especially vulnerable to the pressures of book and car salesmen.

In the past, unusually high fees have been paid to Filipino travel agencies, both in the Philippines and Hawaii, but no documentation was provided. Some informants claimed that plantation workers have paid travel agencies as much as $4,000.00 to make arrangements, including bribes, for visas.

High fees have been charged by attorneys; however, no documentation was provided. One attorney reported that he charges substantial fees for immigrant problems because usually the case is difficult and time-consuming.

Banks and savings & loan associations are slow in approving loans for qualified immigrant applicants.

A sense of obligation by the immigrant for services or favors rendered may result in problems. For instance, feelings of obligation may occur even when the immigrant has been charged unusually high interest rates for a loan.

Much of the information about the intercultural difficulties of Samoans was published during the mid-1960s; consequently, we should be cautious in generalizing to the problems of more recent Samoan immigrants. Nevertheless, it is reasonable to assume that many of the problems encountered by earlier Samoan immigrants would still occur for present-day Samoan immigrants.

One of the earlier studies (Yost, 1965) reported that Samoan chiefs (matais) in Nanakuli appeared to have almost no authority over how other Samoans spent their money, although the matais did exert considerable social leadership. One interesting pattern reported was that young Samoan women were married to older Filipino men (9 of the 65 couples). However, more comprehensive data concerning out-marriages indicate that there have been relatively few marriages in which Filipino men married Samoan women (see Yu, 1971). Yu cites data from the Department of Health, which show that during 1960-69 there were 6,682 Filipino men who were married, with only 54 of these marriages being to Samoan women. Consequently, only 0.8% of all Filipino men during 1960-69 married Samoan women. Of course, the percentage of cases in which older Filipino men married much younger Samoan women would be considerably less than the value of 0.8%.

Almost no discrimination or prejudice directed at themselves was reported by the Samoans in the Yost (1965) study. However, Yost stated that it was her impression that Caucasians and Japanese with whom she talked held uncomplimentary stereotypes of Samoans by labeling them as "lazy, wild, uneducated, irresponsible--but also as friendly." Of course, by labeling the Samoans with such derogatory terms the intercultural problems of the Samoans would be intensified and compounded. For example, what employer is going to hire a "lazy" and "irresponsible" person? Or, what landlord is going to rent to a "wild" and "irresponsible" person? The labels are undoubtedly incorrect when viewing Samoans from a cross-cultural perspective; however, the use of derogatory labels will, in all likelihood, continue to have serious repercussions on the Samoan immigrant. For example, the Rev. Faafouina Iofi (whose Samoan congregation shares the Aldersgate United Methodist Church in Honolulu with another congregation) notes that although local worshippers accept Samoans, they tend to isolate them because of their different life style. According to Iofi, Samoans sometimes identify themselves as Hawaiians or islanders from elsewhere in the Pacific in order to escape a stigma created by a minority of Samoans who break the law (Sunday Star Bulletin & Advertiser, July 2, 1972).

The Kalihi Valley Housing study by Ala'ilima (1966) indicated that the "control of children" is viewed as the most difficult problem for Samoan adults. Other problems reported were: lack of obedience, fighting, glue sniffing, sexual promiscuity, stealing, tattling, debts from payments of loans and credit buying, kinship contributions preventing an improvement in the standard of living (such as wedding and graduation celebrations). Also, it was reported that Samoans are hesitant to contact schools and police, even in times of need, because their families would feel ashamed.

The study of Samoans in the Palama area by Ala'ilima & Ala'ilima (1966b) noted that 14 of 45 families surveyed were not satisfied with their neighbors, with the dissatisfactions being attributed to noisy parties, loud swearing, and gangs of delinquent boys. Also, although the Samoan families seemed to be aware of problems of income, they apparently failed to plan or account for their expenditures. Expenditures tended to focus on such items as TVs, cars, ceremonies, church contributions, and assisting their relatives.

Other problem areas of the Samoans were mentioned by Samoan respondents during the 1969 "Governor's Conference on Immigration," such as the following:

HDA - 56

They do not go to the hospital until it is too late.

If you go to a hospital, you are not with your family and will die.

Samoans will seek medical aid for small things, but not on things which may be serious and remove them from the family group.

Samoans don't consider ukus (headlice) a problem. Picking ukus is a social time, with the family, children, and friends gathered for talk.

There have been some severe reactions to our health regulations and instructions in this area, i.e., a mother shaving a girl's head so the lice couldn't hide in the hair.

They are not aware of the availability of services open to them.

Communication is difficult. There is a cultural resistance to answering questions which seem to pry into family affairs.

Other problems of Samoan immigrants have been mentioned by Cunningham (1972), based upon her general observations and interviews with Samoans and persons who are associated with Samoans:

Samoans compose a disproportionately high proportion of residents in Hawaii jails. It was reported by the police that their offenses were usually misdemeanors, e.g., many cases of drunkenness.

Physical punishment of children is common among Samoans, which may result in conflicts with other authorities in Hawaii.

Quotes taken from interviews included such statements as:

"If he drinks he starts looking for a fight."

"Samoans are not dependable. They might show up for work one day and stay home the next."

It should be kept in mind that the preceding statements concerning the intercultural problems of Filipinos and Samoans are essentially impressions of various individuals. In fact, the statements may not coincide with the actual problems of recent immigrants. At the most, the statements suggest areas in which problems may be occurring for some recent immigrants.

At a recent "Samoan Heritage Conference" at the University of Hawaii (May 1972), the speakers noted many of the intercultural problems that Samoans tend to encounter in Hawaii. High Chief Fuifatu Fau'olo noted that some Samoan customs may result in problems for apartment dwellers, for instance,

the preparation of coconuts in apartment doorways would most likely annoy non-Samoan neighbors. Fay Ala'ilima related some of the intercultural problems that might be faced by a fictional Samoan girl who lives in public housing at Kuhio Park Terrace. A paraphrasing of the story follows:

> In school, Sione is reproved by her teacher for misconduct but since she does not receive any physical punishment, such as a cuffing which is considered normal in Samoa, she decides that the teacher is either not serious or afraid of her. As a result of the misunderstanding, she stops going to school. A social worker visiting the family then concludes that the parents don't care about their youngster since they are not certain of her whereabouts. The parents indeed care very much but they are used to the Samoan setting where a child is free to wander from family to family in the village and even to sleep over with another family because she is safe with relatives and members of the village. When Sione's father understands the situation at school he assures the social worker that he will give Sione a thorough beating. The social worker is horrified and concludes that the father treats the child brutally.

A recent article by Ablon (1971), contrasting the adaptation of Samoans and American Indians to a West Coast city, emphasized the exceptionally good adjustment of Samoans to an urban environment. Ablon wrote that Samoans rarely report feeling any discrimination and that the Samoan and American cultures are confortably compatible. The extended family and Samoan community are of extreme importance in assisting recent immigrants and in providing an economic cushion during times of crisis, e.g., temporary unemployment. Furthermore, Samoans were described as relating well to employers and to other non-Samoans, despite some difficulties with the English language. If Ablon's impressions about Samoans on the West Coast are correct, there may be available some very effective methods for assisting the recent Samoan immigrant in Hawaii. Perhaps the methods could be based upon the apparently successful system that West Coast Samoans have developed to adjust to an urban American culture.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The preceding review of the various problems of recent immigrants indicates that future research should focus on (a) collecting accurate descriptive information, and (b) conducting longitudinal studies, i.e., studying immigrants over a period of time. Descriptive information about the demographic characteristics of immigrants in Hawaii would be especially valuable. Also, information about institutions, both private and public, that provide critical services (or potential services) to the immigrant would be quite useful. Longitudinal studies would allow for the specification, along a temporal dimension, of the types of problems that immigrants undergo in Hawaii. In conjunction with the need for descriptive information and longitudinal studies, there are a number of potentially relevant variables that, in all liklihood, are affecting the difficulties that immigrants encounter. A further description of the suggested areas for future research follows:

Descriptive Information

1. Demographic data. One of the major deficiencies in the data concerning immigrants is in the area of basic demographic information. For instance, an accurate account of where recent immigrants go upon arriving in Hawaii is lacking, and knowledge about the geographic patterning of different immigrant groups is quite rudimentary, if available at all. However, each state has a potential source of useful demographic data, because the Immigration and Nationality Act (66 Stat. 163) requires that all aliens file an address report card each year during the month of January. The card includes the following information: alien number, social security number (if any), address, citizenship, sex, age, alien status (immigrant, visitor, crewman, student, exchange alien, other--specify), port of entry into U.S., date of entry, employer, occupation. If made available, such information would provide an excellent basis for investigating immigrant problems and for assisting immigrants in adjusting to Hawaii. Moreover, useful comparisons could be made between such items on the card as geographic location and country of origin, e.g., to show where recent Filipino immigrants are living. Other comparisons could include occupation vs. country of origin, sex vs. country of origin, age vs. geographic location, and immigrants vs. other aliens. By comparing the data for different years, one could describe both the movement of immigrants within the State and the number of immigrants leaving Hawaii.

2. Institutional data. There are several federal agencies and departments of the State of Hawaii that provide important services to the immigrant, e.g., the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service, the Departments of Health, Education, and Social Services & Housing. Also, there are a number of agencies and programs in Hawaii primarily designed to assist immigrants, e.g., the State Immigration Service Center, the Model Cities English Language and Cultural Orientation Project (ELCO), the Leeward Immigrant Center, and various citizenship classes. A description and evaluation of these departments, agencies, and programs, including the types, scope, and manner of delivery of services would be valuable in indicating institutional capability and responsiveness concerning immigrants.

Longitudinal Studies

Apparently there have been no rigorously conducted longitudinal studies of immigrants in Hawaii (a longitudinal study would consist of taking measures of the same group of immigrants over a period of time). Ideally, the collection of data in a longitudinal study of immigrants would begin before the immigrants' departure from their home country and data would continue to be collected for several years after their arrival in Hawaii. Unfortunately, a long-term longitudinal study is rarely feasible because of time and financial restraints; however, an abbreviated longitudinal study, perhaps beginning with the immigrants' arrival in the United States and lasting for 6 months or more, would still provide useful information. Because the problems of immigrants tend to be the most severe during their first year in a new country, future research might best focus on this early stage.

In conjunction with a longitudinal study, future research might benefit from the following: (a) focus on the statements and acts of successful immigrants so that these adaptive behaviors can be taught to other immigrants, (b) employment of systematic measures throughout a longitudinal study (perhaps on a weekly basis), (c) use of unobtrusive measures (measures that do not influence the immigrant), (d) measurement of specific behaviors of the immigrant rather than attempting to make inferences about his motives or attitudes, and (e) study of several cultural groups simultaneously, e.g., groups of recently arrived Samoans, Filipinos, and Koreans could be studied over the same time period, matching the groups on relevant variables such as socio-economic position.

Potential Variables

Although there is an infinite number of relationships that could be investigated, those revealed through the following comparisons seem to be among the more important ones for understanding the problems of recent immigrants: (a) length of stay of recent immigrants vs. longer-term immigrants, (b) problems of male vs. female immigrants, (c) problems of families vs. individuals, (d) relationships between English proficiency, job skills, educational level, and cultural background, and (e) relationships between the preceding variables and other information about immigrants. All of these variables can be effectively studied by relating them to accurate demographic and institutional data and by employing longitudinal designs.

REFERENCES

Ablon, J. Retention of Cultural Values and Differential Urban Adaptation: Samoans and American Indians in a West Coast City. Social Forces, 1971, 49, 385-393.

Agmata, H. Y. "Final Report on the Program of Health Education of Immigrants." Unpublished report to the Chamber of Commerce of Hawaii, Department of Health, 1970.

Ala'ilima, F. C., & Ala'ilima, V. J. "Proposal For A Samoan Community Program." Unpublished report, Sinclair Library, University of Hawaii, 1966. (a)

Ala'ilima, F. C., and Ala'ilima, V. J. "Samoan Pilot Project: A Preliminary Report." Unpublished report of the Honolulu Community Action Program, Sinclair Library, University of Hawaii, 1966. (b)

Ala'ilima, V. J. "Report On Samoan Survey--Kalihi Valley Housing." Sponsored by Susannah Wesley Settlement. Unpublished report, Sinclair Library, University of Hawaii, 1966.

Ala'ilima, V. J., Fau'olo, F., et al. "Proposal For A Samoan Community In Hawaii." Unpublished memo to Lieutenant Governor George Ariyoshi, State of Hawaii, February 1, 1972.

American Almanac: The U.S. Book of Facts, Statistics and Information for 1972. New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1972.

"Annual Report of the Immigration and Naturalization Service" for 1971. U.S. Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service, 1972.

Ayabe, H. I., & Gilson, T. Q. "The Evaluation Report of the State Manpower Development and Acculturation Project." (Provided by the Pacific Training Council for the Hawaii State Department of Labor and Industrial Relations and the University of Hawaii Industrial Relations Center.) Unpublished report, University of Hawaii Industrial Relations Center, 1972.

Bernard, W. S. American Immigration Policy--a Reappraisal. New York: Harper, 1950. In O. Handlin (Ed.), Immigration as a Factor in American History. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1950. Pp. 192-199.

Boyd, M. Oriental Immigration: The Experience of the Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino Populations in the United States. International Migration Review, 1971, 5, 48-60.

Brein, M., & David, K. H. Intercultural Communication and the Adjustment of the Sojourner. Psychological Bulletin, 1971, 76, 215-230.

Christensen, S. K. The New Resident: Hawaii's Second-Class Citizen. Hawaii Bar Journal, 1968, 77-82.

Cunningham, H. Unpublished field and interview notes, Office of Social Resources, City & County of Honolulu, 1972.

David, K. H. Culture Shock and the Development of Self-Awareness. Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy, 1971, 4(1), 44-48.

David, K. H. Intercultural Adjustment and Applications of Reinforcement Theory to Problems of "Culture Shock." Trends, 1972, 1-62. (Issued by the Center for Cross-Cultural Training & Research, Hilo, Hawaii.)

De Leon, D. Ota Camp--Still Time. Ka Leo, April 21, 1972.

Developments in the Law--Employment Discrimination and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Harvard Law Review, 1971, 84, 1109-1316.

"Fact Sheet: The 1965 Amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act." American Immigration and Citizenship Conference. New York: AICC, 1969. In "Proceedings of the Governor's Conference on Immigration, 1969." Vol. II. Conference held Dec. 11 & 12, 1969. Honolulu: Commission On Manpower and Full Employment, 1970.

Forster, J. "The Assimilation of Samoan Migrants in the Naval Housing Area, Pearl Harbor, Hawaii." Unpublished master's thesis, Sinclair Library, University of Hawaii, 1954.

Greene, K. "Occupational Licensing, Protection for Whom?" Manpower, 1969, 1(6). Cited by Miyagi, A. Y. "Professional and Occupational Regulatory Boards and Commissions of the State of Hawaii." Legislative Reference Bureau, University of Hawaii, December 1970.

Harper, E. J. Changing Immigration Trends. I & N Reporter, 1968, 17(1), 1-3.

"Hawaii Housing Authority Composite Report, July 1, 1970 to June 30, 1971." Hawaii Housing Authority, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Hawaii Revised Statutes. Vol. 5, Titles 22-25, Chapters 401-475. State of Hawaii, 1968. Also, HRS, 1971 supplement.

"Hawaii's In-migrants, 1971." Statistical report 89, Department of Planning and Economic Development, State of Hawaii, 1972.

Hernando-Hill, M. "Report of the Airport Demonstration Project, June 15 - December 15, 1971." In "Report of the State Immigration Service Center." 1972, 57-71.

Hirata, L. C. "Immigrant Integration In A Polyethnic Society." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Sinclair Library, University of Hawaii, 1971.

Hoff, R. P. "Citizens and Resident Aliens Employed Abroad." L. L. Silverstein (Ed.) #13-3rd Tax Management, Bureau of National Affairs, Inc., Foreign Income Portfolios, 1970. Pp. A-1 through C-11.

Honolulu Advertiser, October 21, 1971. Keller, M. Bar Exam Residency Rule Voided.

Honolulu Advertiser, November 12, 1971. Lueras, L. Nakatani Housing's At End of The Road.

Honolulu Advertiser, November 22, 1971. Hoyt, C. Foreign Trained Find No Place For Their Skills.

Honolulu Advertiser, November 23, 1971. Hoyt, C. Not Land of Plenty, But Probably Better Than Old Country.

Honolulu Advertiser, January 14, 1972. Shacks Go As Sewers Come: Anger In Ota Camp.

Honolulu Advertiser, June 2, 1972. Filipina Gets Her Job Back After Taking Case To Court.

Honolulu Advertiser, June 13, 1972. No Lawyer, Not A Day In Jail, Supreme Court Rules.

Honolulu Star-Bulletin, December 1, 1971. Altonn, H. Welfare Tenants Dislike High-Rise.

Honolulu Star-Bulletin, December 3, 1971. Altonn, H. Fantastic Amount Goes Down Drain: Where Do Welfare Rentals Go?

Honolulu Star-Bulletin, April 17, 1972. Altonn, H. Only A Few Residency Requirements Remain On The Books.

Honolulu Star-Bulletin, June 7, 1972. New Powers Given To Police.

Honolulu Star-Bulletin, June 15, 1972. Erickson, L. Five Chinese Challenge Federal Employment Ban.

Kung, S. W. Chinese In American Life. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1962. Cited by Boyd, M. Oriental Immigration: The Experience of the Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino Populations in the United States. International Migration Review, 1971, 5, 48-61.

Lasman, L., Buluran, O. J., Nolan, J., and O'Neil, L. "A Study of Attitudes of Filipino Immigrants about Hawaii." Unpublished master's thesis, University of Hawaii, 1971.

"Licensed Occupations in Hawaii." Department of Labor and Industrial Relations, State of Hawaii, January, 1972.

Lim, G. D. "Kalihi Area Needs Survey." Final composite report, Dec. 20, 1971. Undertaken by the Maryknoll Sisters. Unpublished report, Maryknoll Sisters, Honolulu, 1971.

Lind, A. Hawaii's People. (3rd ed.) Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1967.

Miyagi, A. Y. "Professional and Occupational Regulatory Boards and Commissions of the State of Hawaii." Legislative Reference Bureau, University of Hawaii, December 1970.

Morimoto, A. M. F. "Licensure of Foreign Dental Graduates." Report No. 4, Legislative Reference Bureau, 1971. In response to Senate Resolution No. 291, 1970 Regular Session, Fifth Legislature of the State of Hawaii.

"Naturalization Requirements and General Information." United States Department of Justice, Immigration and Naturalization Service. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1970.

"Occupational Licensing and the Supply of Non-Professional Manpower." U.S. Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Manpower Research Monograph No. 11. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969. Cited by Miyagi, A. Y. "Professional and Occupational Regulatory Boards and Commissions of the State of Hawaii." Legislative Reference Bureau, University of Hawaii, December 1970.

"Proceedings of the Governor's Conference On Immigration, 1969." Vols. I & II. Conference held Dec. 11 & 12, 1969. Honolulu: Commission On Manpower and Full Employment, 1970.

"Report of the State Immigration Service Center." Commission on Manpower and Full Employment, State of Hawaii, 1972.

Schmitt, R. C. "Characteristics of Immigrants Moving to Hawaii, July 1, 1968-June 30, 1969." In "Proceedings of the Governor's Conference On Immigration, 1969." Vol. II. Conference held Dec. 11 & 12, 1969. Honolulu: Commission On Manpower and Full Employment, 1970.

Smith, L. E. Recent Immigration to the United States. I & N Reporter, 1971, 19 (4), 50-52.

"Statistical Report, 1970." Department of Health, State of Hawaii, 1972.

Strong, E. K., Jr. The Second-Generation Japanese Problem. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1934. Cited by M. Boyd, Oriental Immigration: The Experience of the Chinese, Japanese, and Filipino Populations in the United States. International Migration Review, 1971, 5, p. 49.

Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser, July 2, 1972. Goo, M. Church is Blessing to Immigrants.

"Survey of Non-English Speaking Students Attending the Public Schools in Hawaii." Research Report No. 58, Office of Research, Department of Education, State of Hawaii, 1968.

Walker, W. "Foreign-born Population of Oahu," from the 1970 United States census, 4th count, based on 5% sample. Unpublished printout, Office of Social Resources, City & County of Honolulu, 1972.

Weinberg, R. D. Eligibility For Entry To The United States of America. Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.: Oceana Publications, 1967.

Yost, M. E. "The Samoans of the Nanakuli-Makaha Area of Oahu, Hawaii." Unpublished master's thesis, Sinclair Library, University of Hawaii, 1965.

Yu, A. Y. "A Study of Chinese Organizations in Hawaii with Special Reference to Assimilative Trends." Paper No. 3, May 1971. East-West Center, Honolulu. Presented at the Interdisciplinary Student Symposia on Culture Learning on May 8, 1971.

APPENDIX

BACKGROUND OF U.S. IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

A. AUTHORITY

The authority to regulate immigration stems from the U.S. Constitution, Article I, Section 8, which empowers the Congress to establish a Uniform Rule of Naturalization.

B. ADMINISTRATION

The admission of aliens at the port of entry is controlled by the Immigration and Naturalization Service which is headed by a Commissioner and under the overall direction of the Attorney General. The issuance of visas is regulated by the Bureau of Security and Consular Affairs through its consular offices abroad, under the direction of an Administrator and the general supervision of the Secretary of State (Weinberg, 1967).

C. SCOPE

All persons physically present in the United States come within one of the following three categories under the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952.

1. United States citizen. Persons born in the United States mainland become citizens at birth. Those born in Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, the Republic of Panama, Alaska, Hawaii, the Virgin Islands, or Guam became United States citizens when the territory was acquired, or if born thereafter, at birth. Persons born outside the United States or its possessions (or outlying possessions, i.e., Swains Island and American Samoa) may be citizens if either one or both parents were citizens and certain residence requirements were satisfied. Naturalized citizens are those who acquire United States citizenship after birth, regardless of whether they do it individually, collectively, or by derivation through a relative (Hoff, 1970).

2. United States national. The only United States nationals under present immigration legislation are the inhabitants of the outlying United States possessions of American Samoa and Swains Island.

3. Alien. Aliens are neither citizens nor nationals of the United States, and they are classified as either immigrants or non-immigrants. An immigrant alien is a person who has entered from abroad and established his permanent domicile in the United States. A non-immigrant alien is a person permitted to enter the United States for a temporary period, e.g., a student or diplomat (Hoff, 1970).

D. LEGAL RIGHTS OF ALIENS

The rights to personal freedom and protection under the Constitution of the United States extend to all persons in the United States--citizen, national, and alien, alike. For example, an alien's property cannot be

seized without just compensation. As protection against illegal imprisonment, he has the right to a hearing before a judge or court through a writ of habeas corpus. Under the 5th and 14th Amendments, he cannot be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, and he must be granted equal protection of the law.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VII) protects all permanent United States residents against discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. Immigrant aliens, therefore, cannot be discriminated against on the basis of citizenship, because it would imply discrimination on account of national origin. However, employment may be refused the non-citizen in the interest of national security pursuant to any statute of the United States or any Presidential Executive Order [Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Title 29--Labor, Part 900 to end, revised January 1, 1971]. Moreover, discrimination (which in the case of religion, sex, or national origin is regulated by a slightly different standard under the Act than that applied to race and color) is allowed "where religion, sex, or national origin is a bona fide occupational qualification reasonably necessary to the normal operation of [a] particular business or enterprise ["Developments in the Law--Employment Discrimination and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964," 1971]." Aside from these exceptions (where the discrimination is related to national security or a bona fide occupational qualification), state laws prohibiting the employment of non-citizens are in conflict with Title VII of the Civil Rights Act (CFR, Title 29--Labor, Part 900 to end, revised January 1, 1971). The Act does not apply to non-immigrant aliens. For example, the employment of such aliens is restricted by law.

E. LEGISLATION

During the first century of the Republic, little was done to restrict immigration. In fact, as transportation facilities were being developed, immigration was encouraged. The first restrictive laws, designed to preclude the entry of criminals, "immoral" persons, "cooly" labor, and paupers, were expanded by 1910 to include polygamists, persons with mental diseases and disabilities, those with loathesome illnesses, anarchists, saboteurs, persons advocating the overthrow of the U.S. government, all governments or all forms of law by force or violence (Weinberg, 1967).

1917 Despite these qualitative measures, resentment towards the increase in unrestricted immigration during the late 1800's resulted in the codification of the various restrictions into what became the first basic immigration law. Provision was made for the medical inspection of immigrants and for deportation of those who had entered unlawfully. Illiterate persons over 16 years old and persons from various Asian countries were barred (Weinberg, 1967).

1921 The 1921 Act was the first quota immigration law enacted with the basis of excludability primarily numerical rather than qualitative. The number of immigrants admissible from any one country was limited to 3% of the number of foreign-born residents from that country

living in the U.S. in 1910. The Act was enacted primarily to limit European immigration, particularly from southern and eastern Europe, the areas from which immigrants had been coming in increasing numbers since 1900 (Bernard, 1950).

1924 The 1924 Act, which became known as the "national origins quota system," reduced the overall number of immigrants and favored the "old immigration" from northern and western Europe by setting the quota number at 2% of the number of foreign-born persons from each country in the U.S. in 1890 (Smith, 1971; The American Almanac, 1972).

1929 The base year for the quotas was changed to 1920.

1952 The new Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 (known as the "McCarran-Walter Act") continued to favor immigrants from northern and western European countries by allocating such countries 80% of the quota numbers (Smith, 1971). National quotas were set at one-sixth of 1% of the number of foreign-born persons from each country living in the U.S. in 1920 (The American Almanac, 1972).

1965 The present Immigration Act (Public Law 89-236, 79 Stat. 911) was designed to make immigration requirements more equitable (a stipulation against persons from the Asia-Pacific triangle was abolished as well as discrimination because of race, sex, nationality, place of birth, or residence), to reunite families, and to bring in skilled persons (Weinberg, 1967; Harper, 1968). It was planned to come into effect in two stages:

The first stage:

From December 1, 1965 to June 30, 1968 quotas were continued, but they were made subject to a new preference system. Unused national quota numbers were pooled and made available to preference applicants who had been unable to obtain visas because their national quotas were oversubscribed. The total number of visa allocations from existing and pooled numbers was limited to 170,000.

The second stage:

Beginning on July 1, 1968, national quotas were abolished and three broad classes of immigrants established:

1. Persons from countries outside of the Western Hemisphere.

   Persons from outside of North and South America are allocated a total of 170,000 visas, with a limitation of 20,000 visas to individual countries. These immigrants are subject to the following preference system:

Preference (P)	Definition	Percent	Numerical Limit
First	Unmarried sons & daughters of U.S. citizens	20	34,000
Second	Spouses & unmarried sons & daughters of alien permanent residents	20	34,000 plus unused nos. from P1
Third	Professionals & scientists and artists of exceptional ability	10	17,000
Fourth	Married sons & daughters of U.S. citizens	10	17,000 plus numbers unused by P1-P3
Fifth	Brothers & sisters of U.S. citizens	24	40,800 plus numbers unused by P1-P4
Sixth	Skilled & unskilled workers in occupations for which there is a U.S. labor shortage	10	17,000
Seventh	Refugees	6	10,200
TOTAL		100%	170,000

2. Special immigrants.

   a. Persons coming from countries in the Western Hemisphere (including their spouses and children if accompanying or following to join them) who are allocated an annual total of 120,000 visas, without any preference system or individual country limitation.

   b. A permanent resident alien returning from a temporary visit abroad.

   c. Certain former U.S. citizens who are eligible to apply for reacquisition of citizenship.

   d. A person who has been a minister of a religious denomination for at least 2 years prior to the date of his application (and his spouse and children if they are accompanying or following to join him) whose services are required by a religious denomination having a bona fide organization in the U.S.

   e. A present or former employee of the U.S. Government abroad (and his accompanying spouse and children) who has served faithfully for at least 15 years, provided the Secretary of State deems it in the national interest to grant special

immigrant status to such an alien in exceptional circumstances.

3. Immediate Relatives.

The children (under 21 years old and unmarried), spouses, and parents of a U.S. citizen (who must be at least 21 years old), are not subject to any numerical limitation.

THE IMMIGRATION PROCESS

A. Documentary Requirements

1. Passport valid for at least 60 days beyond the validity period for an immigrant visa for use as an identity document and unconditional permit to return to the issuing country or some other foreign country, if that is necessary.

2. Valid visa (usually good for four months) or other entry permit.

B. Exemption from Passport Requirement

1. The parent, spouse, or unmarried son or daughter of a U.S. citizen or resident alien (unless the country of origin requires a passport for departure).

2. A resident alien returning from a temporary visit abroad.

3. A child born during the temporary visit abroad of a mother who is a U.S. resident alien or national (if application for admission is made within two years after birth and the child is accompanied by the parent).

4. A stateless alien or national of a communist controlled country unable to obtain a passport and his accompanying spouse and unmarried children.

5. A member of the U.S. Armed Forces.

6. A third preference immigrant and his accompanying spouse and child (unless the country of origin requires a visa and passport).

7. An immigrant who is exempted by the Attorney General and Secretary of State due to inability to obtain a passport.

8. An immigrant showing good cause for failure to present a passport at the port of entry.

C. Exemption from Visa Requirement

1. A child born after issuance of a visa to an accompanying parent if admission is applied for during the period of validity of the visa.

2. A child born during the temporary visit abroad of a mother who is a U.S. resident alien or national (if application for admission is made within two years after birth and the child is accompanied by the parent).

3. A resident alien returning from a temporary absence abroad, who presents an alien registration receipt card (provided the absence did not exceed one year), or a valid reentry permit, or who is a spouse or child of, and resided abroad with, a member of the U.S. Armed Forces. The reentry permit or registration receipt card is invalid if the alien visited certain communist countries or if he is eligible for non-immigrant status.

4. A member of the U.S. Armed Forces in uniform or bearing documents showing previous admittance for permanent residence who is proceeding to the U.S. under official orders or permit.

5. A resident alien returning from Guam, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

6. An American Indian born in Canada with at least 50% blood of the American Indian race.

D. Immigrant Visa Application Process

1. A personal appearance before a consular officer (which may be waived for applicants under 14 years old) is required.

2. An application form (FS-510) is completed.

3. The application is sworn to or affirmed.

4. An application fee of $5.00 is collected.

5. The following supporting documents are presented (2 certified copies of each):

   a. Police certificate (showing any arrest and the disposition of the case).

   b. Prison record (including a report of conduct during confinement).

   c. Military record (showing the applicant's complete service record).

   d. Birth certificate (the original must be shown but it will be returned).

   e. Three photographs (one unsigned and two signed) one and one-half inches square showing a full frontal view of the applicant's face without head covering.

6. Fingerprints are taken of all applicants 14 years old and over.

7. Completion of Form FS-497 ("Preliminary Questionnaire to Determine Immigrant Status") may be required, at the discretion of the consular officer.

8. The consular officer must be satisfied that the applicant will not be a public charge. If the latter is without adequate funds or an assured job, he may be required to furnish affidavits (usually two) of support by U.S. residents guaranteeing that he will not have to rely upon public assistance. In the case of "immediate relatives," "special immigrants," and "preference immigrants," proof of financial ability of these sponsors to furnish support may also be required. As the practice of requiring affidavits does not derive from any statute or regulation, these sponsors are not legally liable if the immigrant becomes a public charge.

9. Certification by the Secretary of Labor indicating a shortage of like labor in the U.S. and in the area of intended employment, as well as that such employment will not adversely affect wages and working conditions of similarly employed workers in this country. This is required of all non-preference immigrants, third and sixth preference immigrants (professionals, skilled and unskilled workers), and "special immigrants" (persons coming from countries in the Western Hemisphere other than immediate relatives of U.S. citizens or residents aliens), who are applying for visas.

   Labor certification is made through two forms: MA7-50B "Job offer for Alien Employment" and MA7-50A "Statement of Qualifications of Alien."

   Under the old law, immigrants were free to enter the U.S. unless the Secretary of Labor imposed a restriction to protect American jobs and wages. Under the 1965 Act, the immigrants are restricted from entry unless the Secretary of Labor rules that they will not adversely affect American workers and wages. In other words ("Fact Sheet: The 1965 Amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act," 1969), "formerly the door was open to the immigrant unless the Secretary of Labor closed it; . . . under the new law the door is closed unless the Secretary of Labor opens it."

   The Department of Labor has two schedules of occupations, Schedule A giving blanket certification and Schedule B restricting certain occupations from certification due to an adequate supply of American workers or because alien employment would depress domestic working conditions and wages. Blanket certification is given in Schedule A to the following immigrants:

   a. Those who have received an advanced degree from an institution of higher learning accredited in the country from which the degree was obtained (comparable to a Ph.D. or master's degree from an American college or university) in the fields of dietetics, medicine and surgery, nursing, pharmacology, and physical therapy.

   b. Those who have received a bachelor's degree from an accredited institution of higher learning in the country from which the

degree was obtained, or have the equivalent experiences and education, in the fields of dietetics, nursing, pharmacology, and physical therapy.

c. Persons coming to conduct religious services or to engage in specified religious activities.

The restricted occupations in Schedule B follow:

Assemblers
Attendants: Parking Lot, Personal Service, Service Station
Bartenders
Bookkeepers II
Bus Boys
Cashiers
Chauffeurs and Taxicab Drivers
Charwomen and Cleaners
Clerks: Hotel, General Grocery
Cooks: Short Order
Counter and Fountain Workers
Electric Truck Operators
Elevator Operators
Floormen
Groundskeepers
Guards and Watchmen
Domestic Household Workers (with less than one year of paid experience)
Housekeepers
Housemen and Yardmen
Janitors
Key Punch Operators
Kitchen Workers and Helpers
Laborers: Farm, Mine, Common
Loopers and Toppers
Maids: Hotel and Motel
Material Handlers
Men-Of-All-Work*
Nurses Aides
Orderlies
Packers, Bottlers, Markers and Related Workers
Painters' Helpers
Porters
Receptionists
Sailors and Deck Hands
Sales Clerk
Sewing Machine Operators and Handstitchers
Street Railway and Bus Conductors
Telephone Operators
Truck or Tractor Drivers
Typists (of lesser skill)
Ushers (Recreation and Amusement)
Warehousemen
Welder's Helpers

Source: Federal Register, Vol. 36 (24) Part II, Section 60.7, February 4, 1971, p. 2466.
*Those who "perform a combination of duties to keep a private home clean and in good condition."

10. Each applicant must submit to a mental and physical examination by a U.S. Public Health Service doctor, if available, or a doctor selected by the applicant from an approved panel of physicians. If laboratory facilities are not available in the country of origin, laboratory tests will be made at the U.S. port of entry.

11. If the applicant intends to precede his family to the U.S., an informal examination of these members may be arranged to ascertain

whether or not there is any physical, mental, or other condition which would make them ineligible to receive a visa. If such is found to be the case, the applicant is required to acknowledge such notification in writing. If he is not so informed, there is still no assurance that visas will be issued to these members. A final judgment as to their eligibility will only be made upon formal application.

12. An approved visa application is recorded on Form FS-511 (Immigrant Visa and Alien Registration) and a fee of $20.00 is collected. The "visa" consists of the application form (FS-510), the visa and registration form (FS-511), and copies of the required supporting documents.

E. Information Obtained Through the Application for Visa

a. Name(s).
b. Age.
c. Sex.
d. Date and place of birth.
e. Present address.
f. Place(s) of previous residence.
g. Marital status.
h. Name(s) and residence(s) of spouse and children.
i. Occupation.
j. Personal description.
k. Languages spoken, read, or written.
l. Names and addresses of parents.
m. If parents are deceased, the name and address of the next of kin in the country of origin.
n. The port of entry to the United States and destination beyond, whether or not a ticket has been obtained to final destination.
o. Whether or not the applicant is coming to join a relative or friend; if so, the latter's name(s) and address(es).
p. The purpose and length of intended stay.
q. A record of previous arrest(s), conviction(s), or imprisonment.
r. Whether or not the applicant was ever treated at an institution for the treatment of insanity or mental disease.
s. If claiming (a) "immediate relative" (i.e., children, who are unmarried and under 21 years old, spouses and parents--at least 21 years old--of U.S. citizens at least 21 years old), (b) "special immigrant" (i.e., persons from the Western Hemisphere, resident aliens returning from temporary visits abroad, former citizens who lost their citizenship through marriage or service in the allied armed forces in World War II, ministers of religious denominations who have bona fide organizations in the U.S. requiring their services, and present and former employees of the U.S. Government abroad who have served faithfully for at least 15 years), or (c) "preference immigrant" status, the facts upon which the claim for such status [(a), (b), or (c)] is based. In (a) and (b) a petition is filed, in some cases by the sponsor, in some cases by the applicant, and in some cases by either.

t. Whether or not the applicant is a member of a class excluded from the immigrant laws.

F. Refusal of Application

1. If any of the conditions in the visa application process (see E. Information Obtained Through the Application for Visa) are not fulfilled or are refused, no visa will be issued.

2. If it appears that the potential applicant lacks some of the requirements for the granting of a visa, he may be verbally advised to this effect so as not to have to forfeit the $5 application fee.

3. No formal refusal of a candidate will be made unless an application is executed.

4. If a visa is refused, the supporting documents for the application will be returned and copies of the documents will be kept on file.

5. If additional evidence is required, the application and supporting documents will be retained for 120 days pending submission of such evidence.

THE NATURALIZATION PROCESS*

A. General Eligibility Requirements (see below for special classes with partial exemption)

1. Age. An applicant must be at least 18 years old.

2. Lawful admission. The applicant must have been lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

3. Residence. The applicant must have resided in the U.S. continuously for at least five years immediately prior to the date on which he files a petition for naturalization. He must have resided in the State where the petition is filed for at least the last 6 months of the five-year residency period. During the five-year period, short trips abroad are permissible so long as the total time abroad does not exceed 30 months and there is no continuous period of absence of over one year. Special permission may be granted for exceeding one year without the forfeiture of continued residence to employees of the U.S. Government and certain international, business, research, and religious organizations.

4. Loyalty. The applicant must believe in the principles of the U.S. Constitution and be a person who is "favorable to the good order and happiness of the United States ["Naturalization Requirements and General Information," 1970, p. 12]."

5. Good moral character. An applicant cannot be considered of good moral character if during the five years preceding application for naturalization he was within one of the following classes: habitual drunkards, adulterers, polygamists, persons connected with prostitution or narcotics, criminals, convicted gamblers, persons getting their principal income from gambling, persons who lie under oath to gain a benefit under the immigration or naturalization laws, persons convicted and jailed for as much as 180 days, persons convicted of murder at any time, and persons who have not performed their duty to serve in the U.S. armed forces.

6. Communist party and similar membership. A person is not eligible for naturalization if during the ten years prior to the filing of his petition for naturalization he was a member or connected with the Communist Party or a similar party within or outside the U.S., unless such membership "was involuntary, or before 16 years of age, or compelled by law, or to get employment, food or other necessities of life ["Naturalization Requirements and General Information," 1970, p. 14]."

7. Deportation. A person who has been ordered to leave the U.S. cannot be naturalized.

*Except for D and part of C1b, the requirements are abstracted from "Naturalization Requirements and General Information," 1970.

8. Literacy. Unless physically unable to do so, an applicant for naturalization must be able to understand, speak, read, and write simple English. If he is physically able to write, he must be able to sign his name in English. These requirements do not apply to persons over 50 years old on December 24, 1952 who had been living in the U.S. for at least 20 years.

9. Education. Every applicant for naturalization must show that he knows something about the history and government of the U.S. (the aged persons in No. 8 are not excluded from this requirement). An oral examination on the history and form of government of the U.S. and on English will be made at the time that the applicant files his petition for naturalization (the examination questions are asked in simple English).

10. Oath of Allegiance. At the final Court hearing, before being granted citizenship, the applicant must take an oath of allegiance to the U.S. He must also promise to bear arms or fight for the U.S. or to perform other types of service in the U.S. armed forces, unless it is against his religion to do so.

B. Naturalization Procedure

1. An application (Form N-400, "Application to File Petition for Naturalization") is filed with the Immigration and Naturalization Service, along with a biographic information form, fingerprint card (not required of those under 14 years of age), and three unsigned photographs.

2. After preliminary processing of the application, the applicant will be notified by mail as to the time and place he is to appear before a naturalization examiner for an examination on the application. The examiner will determine whether or not he meets the general naturalization requirements, as described in the preceding section.

   The applicant is to bring 2 witnesses with him to this examination who know him well and can testify as to his character, loyalty, residence, and other matters. They must have known and seen the applicant in the applicant's State of residence for at least the last six months prior to the petition for naturalization. If the witnesses have not known the applicant for the full five-year period, additional witnesses must be provided to cover the five-year period.

3. After the examination on the application, the applicant files a petition for naturalization and pays a $25.00 fee.

4. After a wait of at least 30 days following the examination, and after all investigations of fitness for citizenship have been completed, the applicant is notified to appear before the naturalization court for a final hearing. At the hearing, the naturalization examiner recommends that citizenship be granted and the judge implements the

recommendation by administering the oath of allegiance. A petitioner for naturalization, whom the examiner has not found qualified for citizenship, may also appear at the final hearing with or without an attorney, and submit to questioning by the judge who will decide whether or not to grant the petitioner citizenship.

C. Naturalization Requirements for Special Classes

1. Spouses of U.S. citizens.

   a. A person whose spouse has been a U.S. citizen for at least 3 years and who has been married and living with this citizen spouse for at least the 3 years prior to the filing of the petition of naturalization, may become a citizen if he meets the requirements listed in section A (General Eligibility Requirements). However, only 3 years residence in the U.S., with at least 18 months actual presence, is necessary. His witnesses must have known him for only the 3 year period.

   b. A person whose spouse is a U.S. citizen regularly working abroad in the service of the U.S. Government or certain American business, research, or religious organizations or certain international organizations, who intends to live abroad with the citizen spouse upon becoming naturalized, and who will again reside in the U.S. after the foreign service is completed may become a citizen if the naturalization requirements are met. However, the petition may be filed in any naturalization court rather than in the place where the petitioner lives, and physical presence in the U.S. after admission for permanent residence is not required. Witnesses need only have known the applicant long enough to form a conclusion as to his qualifications for citizenship. (For complete listings of the aforementioned research and public international organizations, see Code of Federal Regulations, Title 8--Aliens and Nationality, Sections 316a.2 and 316a.4. Concerning the aforesaid business and religious organizations, the Immigration and Naturalization Service determines eligibility for the preceding exemption from some of the naturalization requirements after examining documentation on the nature of the particular organization.)

   c. A person whose citizen spouse died during a period of honorable and active service in the U.S. armed forces, who was living in marital union with the spouse at the time of death, is eligible for naturalization subject to the same requirements as those for spouses in 1b of this section.

2. Children of citizen parents.

   a. A child (under 18 years old) born abroad of one or two citizen parents is subject to the following conditions and exemptions:

(1) One or both parents must file an application on behalf of the child (Form N-402, "Application to File Petition for Naturalization in Behalf of Child").

(2) No fingerprint card is required if the child is under 14 years old.

(3) The final admission to citizenship must be completed before the child is 18 years old.

(4) The education and literacy requirements are waived.

(5) There is no requirement of physical residence in the U.S. following admission as a permanent resident.

(6) Citizen witnesses are not required to have known the child or his parent(s) for a certain period of time.

(7) The oath of allegiance is waived if the child is too young to understand it.

b. A child adopted by one or two citizen parents not stationed abroad is eligible for naturalization subject to the conditions in 2a of this section, except that:

(1) The child must have been adopted, either in the U.S. or abroad before reaching the age of 16.

(2) Following admission to the U.S. as a permanent resident, the child must have resided in the U.S. in the legal custody of his adoptive parent(s) for the two years prior to the filing of the petition of naturalization in his behalf, and he must have been physically present in the U.S. for at least 12 months.

(3) The citizen witnesses are required to have known the child and his parent(s) for only 2 years prior to the filing of the petition.

c. A child adopted by one or two citizen parents stationed abroad in the service of the U.S. Government, or certain American business, research (see C1b) or religious organizations, or certain public international organizations (see C1b) is eligible for naturalization subject to the conditions in 2a of this section, except that:

(1) The adoptive citizen parent serving abroad must intend for the child to reside with him abroad following naturalization and for the child to reside in the U.S. after the overseas assignment is completed.

(2) The child must have been adopted, either in the U.S. or abroad, before he reached the age of 16.

(3) The petition for naturalization may be filed in any naturalization court.

(4) Physical presence in the U.S. after admission as a permanent resident is not required.

(5) Citizen witnesses need only have known the child long enough to have formed a conclusion regarding his qualifications for citizenship.

3. Former United States citizens.

a. Any person who lost U.S. citizenship between September 1, 1939 and September 2, 1945 as a result of service in the armed forces of a foreign country that was not at war with the U.S. during any part of his service and that fought against a country with which the U.S. was at war after December 7, 1941 and before September 2, 1945 is eligible for naturalization if he meets the general requirements for naturalization. Exceptions to the general requirements are:

(1) He may file his petition for naturalization in any naturalization court.

(2) No physical residence in the U.S. after his admission for permanent residence is required.

(3) The fact that he was deported from the U.S. does not in itself bar him from citizenship.

b. A woman who married an alien or whose husband became naturalized in a foreign country before September 22, 1922 or who married an alien who was not of the white or African race between that date and March 3, 1931 and who married in order to relinquish her U.S. citizenship is eligible to reacquire such citizenship through a simplified procedure. In some cases, all that is required is the taking of the oath of allegiance to the U.S., while in others, a petition for naturalization must be filed, although exemption is granted from some of the general naturalization requirements.

4. Servicemen or veterans.

a. A person who served honorably and actively in the U.S. armed forces for any part of World War I, World War II, the Korean War or since February 28, 1961 is subject to the following exemptions from the general naturalization requirements:

(1) If the person was inducted, enlisted, or reenlisted in the U.S., the Panama Canal Zone, American Samoa or Swains Island, he is not required to be admitted first as a permanent resident.

(2) If the person entered the U.S. armed forces in any place other than those in the preceding sentence, admission as a permanent resident is first required.

(3) No period of physical residence in the U.S. is required.

(4) Witnesses need have known the person only long enough to be able to judge his qualifications for citizenship based on personal knowledge.

(5) The petition for naturalization may be filed in any naturalization court.

b. "Lodge Act" enlistees. A serviceman or veteran may be naturalized without first being admitted to the U.S. as a permanent resident and without having physically resided there for any particular length of time if:

(1) He enlisted in the U.S. Army abroad after June 30, 1950 under the "Lodge Act."

(2) He has completed at least 5 years of military service.

(3) He has been honorably discharged.

(4) He has entered the U.S., Panama Canal Zone, American Samoa, or Swains Island under military orders.

c. Three-year veterans. Persons who have been admitted to the U.S. for permanent residence and who have been honorably discharged after serving at least 3 years in the U.S. armed forces are eligible for the following exemptions:

(1) If the 3 years service was continuous and application for naturalization was made no later than 6 months after discharge, no physical residence in the U.S. for a certain period is required. Witnesses must have known the person only long enough to have a valid basis for judging his qualifications for citizenship. The petition for naturalization may be filed in any naturalization court and prior deportation does not, in itself, preclude the granting of citizenship.

(2) If the 3 years service was not continuous for the five years prior to the filing of the petition of naturalization, residence in the U.S. is required during the periods of

interrupted military service and the other general naturalization requirements must be met and corroborated by citizen witnesses. However, the petition for naturalization may be filed in any naturalization court and prior deportation, in itself, does not preclude the granting of citizenship. The petition for naturalization must be filed within 6 months after the termination of military service.

(3) If the petition for naturalization is filed more than 6 months after the termination of military service, the person must meet the general naturalization requirements, except that his military service within five years of the date of filing the petition is considered physical residence in the U.S. and prior deportation does not, in itself, preclude the granting of citizenship.

5. Seamen. A seaman whose employment on board a U.S.-owned or registered vessel requires him to be absent from the U.S., who has been admitted for permanent residence and whose overseas work falls within the five years prior to the filing of the petition of naturalization, may count the time spent overseas on the vessel as part of his period of physical residence in the U.S.

6. Employees of U.S. organizations abroad engaged in the dissemination of the information promoting U.S. interests abroad (e.g., Radio Free Europe, Inc.). Such persons are exempted from the requirement of physical residence in the U.S. if they were continuously employed by the organization for five years following admission as a permanent resident, if the petition for naturalization was filed within 6 months after the termination of service with the organization, and if they plan to reside in the U.S. after the end of their foreign employment.

D. Naturalization Requirements for Non-citizen United States Nationals

The only non-citizen United States nationals [a "national" is defined as a person owing permanent allegiance to a state (United States Code, Title 8, Section 1101) (a) (21)] are (a) persons born in the outlying possession of the United States (American Samoa and Swains Island), (b) persons born outside of the United States or its outlying possessions of non-citizen parents who are U.S. nationals, or (c) persons under five years of age of unknown parentage found in an outlying possession of the United States, who, prior to reaching the age of 21 have not been shown to have been born outside of the outlying possession (United States Code, Title 8, Section 1408).

All of the General Eligibility Requirements for naturalization cited previously also pertain to non-citizen United States nationals. However, for the non-citizen national, 5 years residence in American Samoa or Swains Island satisfies the requirement of 5 years residence in the United States. Nevertheless, the normal requirement of 6 months residence in the State where the petition for naturalization is filed must still be

fulfilled. Thus, an American Samoan national seeking naturalization in Hawaii must have resided in the state for 6 months prior to filing a petition for naturalization in the state. His previous residence in American Samoa satisfies the rest of the 5 years U.S. residence requirement (United States Code, Title 8, Section 1436).

E. Declaration of Intention to Become a Citizen

Prior to the present naturalization law (1952), a wait of at least two years after the filing of a declaration of intention (known as the "first paper") was required before an applicant could file a petition for naturalization. Under the present law, the petition can be filed as soon as residency and other requirements are met. However, for the purpose of employment or securing a license, a declaration of intention may still be filed, if the applicant is at least 18 years old and a permanent resident. The procedure is to first file an "Application to File Declaration of Intention" (Form N-300), together with 3 photographs, with the Immigration and Naturalization Service. After processing of this application, the applicant will be notified to appear at the office of the clerk of the nearest naturalization court where he then files the declaration of intention and pays a $5.00 fee.